

remedy some of the problems caused by still water impoundments. Further, we have burdened future North Carolinians with too many unknown problems, not the least of

which will be what to do with all these reservoirs when they eventually silt up and fill in.

We see no responsible course of action at

this time except to place this river in trust for posterity by recommending that it be included in the Natural and Scenic Rivers System.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Friday, August 9, 1974

The House met at 11 o'clock a.m.

Rev. Jack P. Lowndes, Memorial Baptist Church, Arlington, Va., offered the following prayer:

If any of you lacks wisdom, let him ask of God—and it will be given him.—James 1: 5.

We are grateful, our Father, for the Founding Fathers of our Nation who sought and found wisdom from Thee and gave us the form of government that keeps us now.

Today we continue to need that wisdom beyond our own. We pray for Thy wisdom. We pray for the President leaving office and the President assuming office today. They both need Thy wisdom, strength, and the assurance of Thy love. Help our new President make the decisions that will bring reconciliation to our Nation and help bring peace to our world.

For the Speaker of this House and those who serve with him we pray. As they work together for the good of our Nation help them to have that divine wisdom needed.

We pray for the news media who have the responsibility of reporting to us the actions of our Government. Give them wisdom to report fairly and impartially the news upon which we all depend to make our judgments and decisions.

Lord, help all of us to have mercy and sympathy toward one another and to be good stewards of our national heritage.

"Grant us wisdom, grant us courage for the facing of this hour."

In Jesus' name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 7218. An act to improve the laws relating to the regulation of insurance companies in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 11108. An act to extend for 3 years the District of Columbia Medical and Dental Manpower Act of 1970; and

H.R. 12832. An act to create a Law Revision Commission for the District of Columbia, and to establish a municipal code for the District of Columbia.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the

House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 3782. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend for 1 year the authorization of appropriations for Federal capital contributions into the student loan funds of health professions education schools.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 15323. An act to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, to revise the method of providing for public remuneration in the event of a nuclear incident, and for other purposes;

H.R. 15581. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 15791. An act to amend section 204(g) of the District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 15322) entitled "An act to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, to revise the method of providing for public remuneration in the event of a nuclear incident, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. PASTORE, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. DOMINICK, and Mr. BAKER to be conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had tabled the conference report on the bill (H.R. 14715) and it further announced that the Senate further insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 14715) entitled "An Act to clarify existing authority for employment of White House Office and Executive Residence personnel, and for other purposes," requests a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCGEE, Mr. RANDOLPH, and Mr. FONG to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 15581) entitled "An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BAYH, Mr. INOUE, Mr. CHILES, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. EAGLETON, Mr. MATHIAS, and Mr. BELLMON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

A NEW HEAD AT THE HELM

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's farewell message was monumental in content and delivery—one of his most impressive speeches. In it there was sadness, an obvious regret at not finishing the task he had undertaken, but no bitterness. It was spoken like a patriot.

He stated well that America cannot afford to have a part-time President—the position he would have had to occupy for the next 6 months while fighting impeachment. We would also have a part-time Congress. The Nation's economy and many external problems are at stake. The slow but deadly paralysis of Watergate and impeachment already have taken too much from America.

Now this terrible period is behind us. America can breathe again, live again, work again. We have a new administration which, hopefully, will bring new drive for a better America and new solutions for America's economic ills.

Gerald Ford is a man of ability and character. I have confidence in him. I sincerely believe that he will seek earnestly to restore harmony, to rebuild America's faith in its Government, and that he will do everything in his power to insure a sound working relationship with Congress. He will need the help and the prayers of the American people in this most difficult task.

Perhaps most of all there is a need to put the bitterness of Watergate and impeachment behind us and to learn again the essentiality of building up, not tearing down, a country. America needs to look ahead, not backward.

THE RESIGNATION OF PRESIDENT NIXON AND THE SWEARING IN OF PRESIDENT FORD

(Mr. BRADEMAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, the resignation of Richard M. Nixon is an event without precedent in our history.

Thirty-seven Presidents have served our Nation with varying degrees of distinction, but until now no Chief Executive has been forced to relinquish his office prior to the end of his term.

For nearly 26 months we have witnessed an unfolding tale of conspiracy, perjury, misuse of Government agencies, and obstruction of justice.

And we have seen a President of the United States approve and participate in such illegal activities while directing a complex plan to conceal his wrongdoing.

We should not forget, nor should we

minimize, the tragic pattern of events which led to Mr. Nixon's announcement.

But our Nation will survive this ordeal, as we have survived more violent upheavals in the past.

We now have a new President, a new custodian of the national trust.

I have known Gerald Ford throughout my 16 years in Congress. He is an honorable man.

President Ford faces the difficult task of reuniting the country, and in this endeavor I join all Americans in wishing him well.

I know that in the future President Ford and I may disagree on some questions of public policy as in the past we sometimes disagreed when we served together in the House.

But on one matter I know we do not disagree.

It is that the public interest now requires that both Congress and the President act together, in a spirit of mutual cooperation, to seek solutions to the problems that beset our Nation in a troubled world.

As a Member of Congress I look forward to working with President Ford for the best interests of the people of our country.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOSEPH P. VIGORITO ON THE RESIGNATION OF THE PRESIDENT

(Mr. VIGORITO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable that this Nation has to witness the resignation of a President. Since we are a Nation governed by laws and not ruled by men, we are left with no other choice.

I am sure that we will come out of this stronger than ever and our democratic institutions will survive.

My best wishes and support go to President Ford in these trying times.

AMERICA NEEDS MENDING

(Mr. STARK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, the worst is over. The American people and their representatives in Congress must now concentrate on the larger problems that confront our Nation—inflation, poverty, unemployment, health care, education, and peace.

Our country needs mending. It can only be done with a Chief Executive willing to share his assignment with the leadership of both major parties. A strong bipartisan effort is needed to restore people's faith in Government and tend to matters that have been neglected for too long because of the Nixon diversion.

THE PRESIDENT RESIGNS

(Mr. GAYDOS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's admission that he withheld important evidence from Congress, the courts, and the American people virtually assured his impeachment by the House and a strong probability of conviction in the Senate.

Previous to this admission, the matter was so grave that in my opinion, every precaution had to be taken to see that full justice was done, not only to President Nixon, but to the Nation at large.

I have spent many hours reading both the White House and the Judiciary Committee transcripts and personally listened to the actual tapes in an effort to be as objective as possible in the event I would be called upon to cast my vote for or against impeachment.

The President's decision to resign has now put that all behind us. As a nation, we have encountered and survived many crises in the course of history: a civil war, several international conflicts, agonized through a major depression, and suffered through Presidential assassinations. We have emerged stronger as we met these crises head on. We will also survive the tragedy of Watergate.

We must now devote our efforts toward providing an orderly transition in Government and begin healing the wounds left by Watergate. It is incumbent upon us to clearly demonstrate to the other nations of the world that our form of government which guarantees freedom and justice to all, has survived another major crisis.

THE PRESIDENT'S RESIGNATION

(Mr. WOLFF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I am saddened by the events that have led to the resignation of our President, but I also feel that we as a nation can take heart that our constitutional processes and system of government have withstood the trauma. The President's resignation is in the national interest; we have provided for the orderly transition of power to a new administration; there will be no lack of continuity in our domestic or international policies nor any weakening of our position in the world community.

We must come together as a nation, healing the wounds of the past so that we can meet the very pressing problems that face us and the world. Let us as well put on notice those throughout the world who would view what has happened as a sign of weakness. To the contrary, this Nation has shown its strength in the face of unprecedented strain.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION, 1975

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1297 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 1297

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that

the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 16136) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 3, rule XIII are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule by titles instead of by sections. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. YOUNG) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1297 provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate on H.R. 16136, the military construction authorization bill for the fiscal year 1975.

House Resolution 1297 provides that the bill shall be read for amendment by titles instead of by sections. House Resolution 1297 also provides that all points of order against the bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 3, rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives—the Ramseyer rule—are waived.

The purpose of H.A. 16136 is to provide military construction authorization and related authority in support of the military departments during the fiscal year 1975. The total authorization in the bill is \$2,983,821,000 and provides construction in support of the active forces and Reserve components, defense agencies and military family housing. Of this total, \$152,267,000 represents construction for the Reserve components.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 1297 in order that we may discuss, debate, and pass H.R. 16136.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1297 provides for the consideration of H.R. 16136, the military construction authorization for fiscal year 1975. The rule has several provisions. It provides for 1 hour of general debate. The bill is open to amendments, and points of order are waived for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 3, rule XIII. This waiver is needed because the committee report does not include a complete Ramseyer of the bill. The rule also provides that the bill be read for amendment by title instead of by sections.

The purpose of this legislation is to authorize \$2.9 billion for military construction for fiscal year 1975. This figure represents a reduction of \$347,957,000 below the amount requested by the Department of Defense. The following chart shows how the funds will be allocated within the Department of Defense:

ORIGINAL DEPARTMENTAL REQUEST AS CONTAINED IN H.R. 14126 TOGETHER WITH THE COMMITTEE ACTION AS REFLECTED IN H.R. 16136

Title	Service	H.R. 14126 department request	Changes in amounts authorized for appropriations	Percent change	H.R. 16136 adjusted totals authorized for appropriations
I	Army	\$696,815,000	-\$85,162,000	-12.2	\$611,653,000
II	Navy	567,674,000	-21,801,000	-3.8	545,873,000
III	Air Force	468,276,000	-67,049,000	-14.3	401,227,000
IV	Defense agencies	47,400,000	-19,000,000	-40.1	28,400,000
V	Family housing and homeowners assistance	1,347,283,000	-161,402,000	-12.0	1,185,881,000
	Deficiency authorization	42,898,000	+5,122,000	+11.9	48,020,000
VII	Reserve forces	150,932,000	+1,335,000	+0.9	152,267,000
Total		3,321,278,000	-\$347,957,000	-10.4	2,973,321,000

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant-at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 327, nays 1, not voting 106, as follows:

[Roll No. 471]

YEAS—327

Abdnor	Cleveland	Fulton
Abzug	Cochran	Fuqua
Adams	Cohen	Gaydos
Anderson,	Collier	Gettys
Calif.	Collins, Ill.	Gialmo
Andrews,	Collins, Tex.	Gilman
N. Dak.	Conlan	Ginn
Annuizio	Conte	Goldwater
Archer	Corman	Gonzalez
Arends	Cotter	Green, Oreg.
Ashbrook	Coughlin	Green, Pa.
Bafalis	Crane	Grover
Barrett	Cronin	Gude
Bauman	Daniel, Dan	Gunter
Beard	Daniel, Robert	Guyer
Bell	W., Jr.	Haley
Bergland	Daniels	Hamilton
Bevill	Dominick V.	Hammer-
Blester	Danielson	schmidt
Bingham	Davis, S.C.	Hanley
Boggs	Davis, Wis.	Hanrahan
Boland	Delaney	Hastings
Brademas	Dellenback	Hawkins
Bray	Denholm	Hébert
Breckinridge	Dennis	Hechler, W. Va.
Brinkley	Dent	Heinz
Brooks	Derwinski	Helstoski
Broomfield	Dickinson	Henderson
Brotzman	Dingell	Hicks
Brown, Calif.	Dorn	Hillis
Brown, Mich.	Downing	Hinshaw
Brown, Ohio	Drinan	Holt
Broyhill, N.C.	du Pont	Holtzman
Broyhill, Va.	Eckhardt	Horton
Buchanan	Edwards, Calif.	Hosmer
Burgener	Eilberg	Howard
Burke, Fla.	Erlenborn	Huber
Burke, Mass.	Eshleman	Hudnut
Burleson, Tex.	Evans, Colo.	Hungate
Burlison, Mo.	Evins, Tenn.	Hunt
Burton, John	Fascell	Ichord
Burton, Phillip	Findley	Johnson, Calif.
Butler	Fish	Johnson, Colo.
Byron	Fisher	Johnson, Pa.
Camp	Flood	Jones, Ala.
Carney, Ohio	Flowers	Jones, N.C.
Carter	Foley	Jones, Okla.
Cederberg	Ford	Jones, Tenn.
Chappell	Forsythe	Jordan
Clancy	Fountain	Karth
Clark	Fraser	Kastenmeier
Clausen,	Frelinghuysen	Kazen
Don H.	Frenzel	Kemp
Clay	Froehlich	Ketchum

Kluczynski	Patman	Stanton,
Koch	Patten	J. William
Kuykendall	Pepper	Stanton,
Lagomarsino	Perkins	James V.
Landgrebe	Pettis	Stark
Latta	Peyster	Steele
Leggett	Pike	Steelman
Lehman	Poage	Steiger, Ariz.
Litton	Preyer	Steiger, Wis.
Long, La.	Price, Ill.	Stokes
Long, Md.	Price, Tex.	Stratton
Lujan	Pritchard	Stubbelfield
Lukens	Quillen	Studds
McClary	Railsback	Sullivan
McCloskey	Randall	Symington
McCollister	Rangel	Symms
McCormack	Rees	Talcott
McEwen	Regula	Taylor, Mo.
McFall	Reuss	Taylor, N.C.
McKinney	Riegle	Teague
Madden	Rinaldo	Thompson, N.J.
Madigan	Roberts	Thomson, Wis.
Mahon	Robinson, Va.	Thornton
Mann	Robison, N.Y.	Tiernan
Martin, N.C.	Roe	Towell, Nev.
Mathias, Calif.	Rogers	Traxler
Mathis, Ga.	Roncallo, Wyo.	Ullman
Mayne	Roncallo, N.Y.	Van Deerlin
Mazzoli	Rooney, Pa.	Vanik
Meeds	Rose	Veysey
Meicher	Rosenthal	Vigorito
Metcalf	Rostenkowski	Waggonner
Mezynsky	Roush	Waldie
Miller	Rousselot	Walsh
Minish	Roy	Wampler
Mink	Roybal	Whalen
Minshall, Ohio	Runnels	White
Mitchell, N.Y.	Ruth	Whitehurst
Mizell	Ryan	Whitten
Moakley	St Germain	Wilson,
Montgomery	Sandman	Charles H.,
Moorhead,	Sarasin	Calif.
Calif.	Sarbanes	Winn
Moorhead, Pa.	Satterfield	Wolf
Morgan	Scherle	Wright
Mosher	Schroeder	Wydlie
Moss	Sebellus	Wydler
Murtha	Seiberling	Yates
Guyer	Shipley	Yatron
Natcher	Shoup	Young, Alaska
Nedzi	Shriver	Young, Fla.
Nelsen	Shuster	Young, Ga.
Nichols	Sikes	Young, Ill.
Nix	Sisk	Young, S.C.
Obey	Skubitz	Young, Tex.
O'Hara	Slack	Zablocki
O'Neill	Smith, Iowa	Zion
Parris	Smith, N.Y.	Zwack
Passman	Spence	

NAYS—1

Harrington

NOT VOTING—106

Addabbo	Conable	Hansen, Idaho
Alexander	Conyers	Hansen, Wash.
Anderson, Ill.	Culver	Harsha
Andrews, N.C.	Davis, Ga.	Hays
Armstrong	de la Garza	Heckler, Mass.
Ashley	Dellums	Hogan
Aspin	Devine	Holifield
Badillo	Diggs	Hutchinson
Baker	Donohue	Jarman
Bennett	Dulski	King
Biaggi	Duncan	Kyros
Blackburn	Edwards, Ala.	Landrum
Blatnik	Esch	Lent
Bolling	Flynt	Lott
Bowen	Frey	McDade
Brasco	Gibbons	McKay
Breaux	Goodling	McSpadden
Burke, Calif.	Grasso	Macdonald
Carey, N.Y.	Gray	Mallory
Casey, Tex.	Griffiths	Maraziti
Chamberlain	Gross	Martin, Nebr.
Chisholm	Gubser	Matsunaga
Clawson, Del	Hanna	Michel

Milford	Reid	Udall
Mills	Rhodes	Vander Jagt
Mitchell, Md.	Rodino	Vander Veen
Mollohan	Rooney, N.Y.	Ware
Murphy, Ill.	Ruppe	Widnall
Murphy, N.Y.	Schneebell	Wiggins
O'Brien	Snyder	Williams
Owens	Staggers	Wilson, Bob
Pickle	Steed	Wilson,
Podell	Stephens	Charles, Tex.
Powell, Ohio	Stuckey	Wyatt
Quile	Thone	Wyman
Rarick	Treen	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Andrews of North Carolina.

Mrs. Grasso with Mr. Diggs.

Mr. Rodino with Mrs. Griffiths.

Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Owens.

Mr. Mitchell of Maryland with Mr. Milford.

Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. Mills.

Mr. Biaggi with Mr. McSpadden.

Mr. Matsunaga with Mr. O'Brien.

Mr. Staggers with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.

Mr. Badillo with Mr. Hanna.

Mr. Steed with Mr. Martin of Nebraska.

Mr. Pickle with Mr. Michel.

Mr. Mollohan with Mr. Maraziti.

Mr. Murphy of Illinois with Mr. Powell of Ohio.

Mr. Hays with Mr. McDade.

Mr. Jarman with Mr. Baker.

Mr. Kyros with Mr. Lott.

Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Del Clawson.

Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Culver.

Mr. Donohue with Mr. Duncan.

Mr. Dulski with Mr. Conable.

Mr. Dellums with Mr. Blatnik.

Mr. Breaux with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.

Mr. Ashley with Mr. Frey.

Mr. Alexander with Mr. Devine.

Mr. Casey of Texas with Mr. Goodling.

Mr. de la Garza with Mr. Esch.

Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Gross.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.

Mr. Flynt with Mr. Hutchinson.

Mr. Gibbons with Mr. Lent.

Mr. Conyers with Mr. Gray.

Mr. Rarick with Mr. Mallory.

Mr. Reid with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts.

Mr. Stephens with Mr. Gubser.

Mr. Stuckey with Mr. King.

Mr. Podell with Mr. Chamberlain.

Mr. Bowen with Mr. Blackburn.

Mrs. Burke of California with Mr. Vander Veen.

Mr. McKay with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.

Mr. Udall with Mr. Harsha.

Mr. Charles Wilson of Texas with Mr. Holifield.

Mr. Aspin with Mr. Hogan.

Mr. Bennett with Mr. Quile.

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Ruppe.

Mr. Schneebell with Mr. Thone.

Mr. Vander Jagt with Mr. Snyder.

Mr. Widnall with Mr. Wyman.

Mr. Wiggins with Mr. Wyatt.

Mr. Bob Wilson with Mr. Ware.

Mr. Treen with Mr. Williams.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 16136) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIKE).

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair designates the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. STEED) as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, and requests the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) to assume the chair temporarily.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 16136, with Mr. DENT (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Under the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIKE) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WHITEHURST) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIKE).

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, today we are presenting H.R. 16136, the military construction authorization bill for fiscal 1975. The purpose of this bill is to provide military construction authorization and related authority in support of the military departments, which is necessary for enactment before appropriations can be provided to finance these activities of the military departments during fiscal year 1975.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the ranking member, my colleague from New York (Mr. KING) and all the members of the subcommittee for their faithfulness and attendance to the subcommittee sessions.

The new authorization request was \$3,278,380,000. This was almost \$300 million over the request for fiscal 1974. The increase requested in fiscal 1975 is due primarily to additional emphasis on people related projects such as bachelor and family housing construction and medical facility replacement and modernization; facilities for the Navy's Trident weapon system, the Air Force shelter program in Europe as well as continued emphasis on the Reserve forces and the pollution abatement program.

The construction proposals contained in the fiscal year 1975 request are located at approximately 300 named installations and there are almost 700 separate construction projects.

After extensive hearings in 25 separate sessions, and review of each project requested by the Department of Defense the committee was successful in searching out those proposals that in our view could be deferred without impairing the

operational effectiveness of the armed services. In addition, our committee is convinced that these reductions will in no way jeopardize our national security.

The committee unanimously voted for a new total in the amount of \$2,973,321,000 in new authorizations and deficiency authorizations. That amount is for specific projects authorized for construction. This is a reduction in the total requested authorization in the amount of \$347,957,000 or a reduction of 10.4 percent.

I would like to discuss each project in H.R. 16136 with you, but I am afraid I would unnecessarily try the patience of this House. However, there are several significant items contained in this bill which I do feel you would be interested in.

In the family housing section of the bill, 10,462 units of new housing were requested, at an average unit cost of \$30,000, an increase of \$2,500 from last year's average. The committee voted to increase from \$27,500 to \$30,000 the average unit cost for housing within the United States—except Alaska and Hawaii; but limit the number of units to be constructed to 5,552.

One of the reasons for cutting the number of housing units to 5,552 was the Defense Department request for 3,000 units which would be assigned to the E-1's, 2's and 3's which heretofore were ineligible for family housing. The committee voted to eliminate these units because it was felt that we just cannot build housing units for all members of the military. In fact when I questioned the Defense witness regarding the reduction in criteria he confirmed my observation that if the criteria had not been reduced there would be no deficiency in family housing for the military in approximately two years, given the number of units requested. Further, the committee deleted 422 units of Navy housing in the Norfolk, Va., area because of objections from the Members representing that area and the local governing bodies. We believe the housing program recommended will be sufficient for the coming year.

In title VI, most of the general provisions contained in this year's bill are identical to those in prior years. Some of the general provisions, however, introduced departures from prior legislation and will be pointed out to the committee.

In section 303 the Defense Department sought to add a subsection providing authority to exceed the limitations contained in subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section 603 up to a maximum of an additional 10 percent if it was determined that such increase was required in order to encourage change in design or construction estimated to affect substantial energy savings consumption or to meet unusual cost increases attributable to difficulties arising out of the energy crisis. The committee deleted the requested section since there were no guidelines on which to really base whether or not this extra expenditure was justified.

In section 606, which prescribes the cost limitation for permanent barracks and bachelor officers quarters, the Department requested an increase of \$2.50

per square foot for permanent barracks and \$3.50 per square foot for bachelor officer quarters, which amounts would also be retroactive to projects previously approved but not put under contract as of the time of enactment of this legislation. The committee voted to leave the square-foot costs limitations as they now exist, which is \$28.50 for barracks and \$30.50 for bachelor officers quarters.

The committee added several sections to title VI, the general provisions, one of which would make the proceeds from the sale of recyclable material available to the services for the cost of collection, handling and sale of the material including purchasing equipment to be used for recycling purposes. Also, the funds could be used for projects for environmental improvement and energy conservation at military facilities.

I would like to bring to your attention two major additions which were made to the bill. In the fiscal year 1974 supplemental request, \$29 million was requested for facilities on the Island of Diego Garcia in the Indian Ocean. As a result of the conference between the House and Senate on the supplemental, it was agreed that this item, which was approved by the House in the supplemental, would be carried over to the fiscal year 1975 military construction authorization bill. The committee voted to approve this Navy request.

The bill as submitted by the Department of Defense contained no request for the Uniformed Services University of Health Sciences. However, under date of July 9, 1974, the committee received a communication from the Department of Defense which stated that the Deputy Secretary of Defense had approved a plan to provide an initial increment of construction funding in the fiscal year 1975 military construction program for the initial facilities required for the Uniformed Services University of Health Sciences. The committee voted to approve the Department's request for an addition to the bill of \$15 million in order that the schedule as stated in Public Law 92-426, which requires 100 medical graduates by 1982, could be met.

That, in a nutshell, is the committee's recommendation to you. There are many details relating to the bill which I did not discuss, but we are ready to answer any Member's questions regarding the committee action and our recommendations. We believe our recommendation to you is a good one, and I recommend the approval of the bill before you, H.R. 16136.

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 16136, the military construction authorization bill for fiscal year 1975. This is a sound bill. I urge its immediate enactment.

Mr. Chairman, my distinguished colleague from New York pointed out to the House the fact that our subcommittee met on 25 separate occasions and examined almost 700 separate construction projects, so this bill is not something that has not been seriously worked on. I do not think I have ever been on a sub-

committee during my years in Congress where all the members worked as hard as the members worked on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to emphasize that on the final day of the subcommittee markup every member of the subcommittee was present and the bill was reported to the full committee unanimously. During the full committee consideration 34 members were present and on the final rollcall, 34 members voted in favor of the bill and none against it. I think these facts deserve emphasis.

Mr. Chairman, this is the second of the major authorization bills that the Armed Services Committee presents to the House each year. Earlier, we presented the military procurement authorization bill. You will remember we adopted the conference report last week.

I would like to express my full support of H.R. 16136 because it recognizes twin goals. It provides construction which our committee believes to be necessary, and at the same time it recognizes the call for economy and a reduction of defense expenditures whenever possible.

I will not take the time of the House to go into extensive detail, because I do not think it is necessary to repeat what most of you have read in our report and heard the chairman of the subcommittee detail in his statement.

The reductions made by the Armed Services Committee were not based on a judgment that the items were not desirable or important, but because the committee felt they could be safely deferred without jeopardizing the security of the Nation or reducing the effectiveness of our military services.

I know that there are Members who feel that there are justifiable programs in their districts which deserve to be authorized. I can only say that, looking at one project alone, I would probably agree with them. However, we are obliged to evaluate each project on its merits relative to other proposed projects. This bill is limited to what we deem essential. We look upon a stable economy as a second line of defense and I believe our committee has conducted itself accordingly.

Mr. Chairman, there are many other things I could say about this legislation, but I will not take the time of the House to do so now. The committee report fully spells out the programs approved, and we are prepared to answer any questions that the Members may have.

I hope the Members of the House will support this bill unanimously.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON).

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I am most pleased to be able to address my colleagues on the military construction bill for fiscal year 1975. The Committee on Armed Services, under the competent leadership of the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana and New York, have achieved a well-balanced facilities construction program for each of the military services. I appreciate the opportunity to speak in support of enactment of this military construction authorization bill. I will address my

remark to title II of the bill, the Navy's program, which totals \$545,873,000.

STRATEGIC FORCES

Under strategic forces, the committee approved \$95 million or approximately 17.4 percent of the amount authorized under title II for facilities construction for the Trident support site, Bangor, Wash. The approved facilities will provide a practical construction schedule for meeting the initial operational capability date of late calendar year 1978 for this weapons system which will be one of the most survivable weapons systems of the Nation's strategic deterrence arsenal.

The approved project includes construction or modification to a number of missile production and missile support buildings, the initial increment of the bachelor enlisted quarters, enlisted mess, Marine Corps berthing and associated administration building, fire station, relocation of the quality engineering and evaluation laboratory, and the second phase of site improvement and utilities and training facility. The Trident facilities represent only 5 percent of the total cost of the system, but they are vital to deployment and economic life-cycle maintenance of the weapons system.

ALL-VOLUNTEER FORCE

In this year's authorization bill, the committee has approved \$180.9 million to support the Navy's efforts to attract and retain personnel under an all-volunteer force. The Navy believes that bachelor housing and community support facilities, medical facilities and cold iron facilities directly impact on the Navy's enlistment and retention of personnel. Community support facilities are clubs, exchanges, libraries, theaters, and other morale, welfare, and recreational facilities. Cold iron facilities are the provision of utilities on a pier that will permit a ship in port to shut down its boiler plant and electrical generation equipment. This allows the crews of the ships to have increased amounts of liberty when in port and enjoy a work routine that is comparable to their civilian contemporaries. Projects approved in the all-volunteer category amount to 33 percent of title II of the authorization bill.

Approved for bachelor housing and messing was \$74.1 million or 14 percent of title II. This will provide spaces for 5,781 E2-E4, 1,135 E5-E6, and 107 E7-E9 personnel.

The Navy's emphasis on bachelor housing and particularly the lower rated personnel should pay dividends in tomorrow's Navy.

The amount approved for community support facilities of \$20.8 million is a significant increase—1.7 times greater—over the amount authorized in fiscal year 1974.

This is the second year of the Navy's efforts to accelerate the modernization of medical facilities. This bill will provide for a long overdue start on modernization of the National Naval Medical Center in Bethesda.

Approved for upgrading and modernization of hospitals, dispensaries, and dental clinics was \$82.3 million or 15 percent of the total authorized under title II. Another \$17.4 million was ap-

proved for upgrading bachelor enlisted quarters, public work shops, roads, parking, and utilities at medical installations. The total approved under the Navy's medical installation modernization program was \$99.8 million.

For cold iron facilities, the Navy requested \$24 million which was 4.3 percent of the authorization request.

The committee approved \$24 million for eight projects at six installations. In addition, two amendments totaling \$7.6 million were approved to provide a capability for converting boilers to burn coal. These amendments are required in accordance with national policies to conserve scarce petroleum resources.

MAJOR WEAPONS SYSTEMS

For major weapons systems the committee approved \$8.7 million for projects that will directly support: the S-3A antisubmarine warfare aircraft, class 688 nuclear attack submarine; light airborne multipurpose system—LAMPS—helicopters which increase the capabilities of destroyer class ships to detect and kill submarines at long range; P-3C antisubmarine warfare patrol aircraft; captor weapons system, which is a remote unattended antisubmarine warfare system, that uses the MK-46 torpedo as its weapon; A-6E and A-7E attack aircraft, and the EA-6B electronic countermeasure aircraft. In addition, \$16.9 million was approved for projects that will be utilized for existing as well as new major weapons systems. These projects will support the S-3A and S-2 antisubmarine warfare aircraft, EA-6B electronic countermeasure aircraft, and A-6 attack aircraft; and F-14 and F-4J fighter aircraft. Facilities are included to house modern flight simulator equipment that will lead to savings in aviation fuel and in the cost-to-train flight crews.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

The sum of \$59 million or approximately 11 percent of the total authorized for the Navy has been approved to abate air and water pollution, with a breakdown between air and water of \$10.9 and \$48.3 million respectively. This authority will provide facilities to reduce the risk of oil pollution and to reclaim oily wastes, improve or develop sewerage systems, provide pier sewers to serve ships in port, and construct the third increment of the demilitarization facility at naval ammunition depot, Hawthorne, Nev. Air pollution control facilities include a propellant disposal facility, solid waste facilities, fuel vapor collection and recovery systems and air emission controls for various industrial and power facilities.

I have covered some of the categories the Navy stressed in this year's bill, but I should make it clear that the Navy's authorization request is not unbalanced for the categories of facilities discussed. The Navy also had approved \$53 million which is 10 percent of title II, for operational facilities which provides airfield runways, parking aprons, a POL pipeline, communications buildings, radar facilities, runway navigational aids, berthing piers, and dredging. Another category with a significant amount approved was training facilities with \$35.6

million. The Navy considers that trained personnel are one of its greatest assets therefore, the Navy has allocated a major amount of its authorization request to training facilities as one of several actions being taken to strengthen, modernize, and vitalize its training programs.

Under the Navy's multiyear programming system, the Navy requests facilities in the various categories on the basis of achieving a generally balanced rate of correction in relation to the backlog of deficiencies, while of necessity pressing forward annually with projects for new weapons systems and new missions. Accordingly, facilities categories such as research and development, supply, administrative and utilities have fewer projects approved but are in general in balance with deficiencies. The committees reduction generally maintained the balance with the one exception of administrative facilities which was one category of facilities that could be deferred with a minimum of impact on the Navy's operations.

I believe the projects authorized under the Navy title fulfill the committee's goal of approving only those projects that are essential to the Nation's national defense interests. I recommend the bill be enacted as reported.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK).

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee for providing this time for me. Also I would like to thank him for investigating what I think is an oversight going on all through the military construction field, an oversight which may be concurrently going on in our Department of Housing and Urban Development.

It came to my attention at the Oakland Naval Hospital in Oakland, Calif., that the Navy was building 35 housing units in the middle of my district at a cost of \$650,000. They are nice units and I think they are well worth that amount, but it turned out that within 12 blocks, which would be considered an easy commuting distance even in an energy shortage and shortage of gasoline, that HUD and FHA owned and had boarded up 60 units.

It also came to our attention that these houses would be available for lease to the Navy. Some of the 60 houses may not be as nice as the ones being built and some of them are much nicer, and they would have provided at far less cost adequate housing for our military personnel.

Further that would have had the effect of providing residents in my district who had good, high-paying jobs and it would have helped to bring these people into the neighborhood.

I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee if he would not join with me in the term ahead to see that we investigate this problem and see that where one branch of the Government owns good housing units, that we find out, through cooperation and more efficient use of Government resources, about it so we might save the Government resources in the future.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, first of all I would like to commend the gentleman not only for raising the issue and bringing it to our attention but also for providing us with documentary evidence and with photographs of the housing that was being built at the same time there was other housing available in the area.

The gentleman was absolutely correct. The gentleman knows I do not always agree with him. On this particular issue he was absolutely correct. There was no justification whatsoever for the Navy building what they built at the time there was the housing available which was adequate in the area. The gentleman was correct.

At the time however that the housing was built, while there is no logical explanation for what happened, as always, there was a legal explanation for what happened. The legal explanation for what happened was that while this other housing had been abandoned it was still not wholly available for the FHA to use.

The redemption time, or whatever it is called in the State of California, they said made it impossible for them to get their hands on it. I happen to think they did not try hard enough. I happen to think they really did not take a look at what else was available.

I can only say we presented them with this evidence. We did our very best to hold their feet to the fire. If additional legislation is required in the correlation between the Departments of Defense and the Federal Housing Authority as to Government-owned housing, if the gentleman will introduce the legislation, I will help get it passed.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the kind offer of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee. I am sure we will have many more of our colleagues joining with us to see where this lack of communication and cooperation between two Government agencies exists, that we can indeed find legislation that will cross over the boundaries of more than one committee. I am sure we will find bipartisan support to be more efficient in this question of the lack of housing.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BRINKLEY).

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak on behalf of this year's budget request for MCA funding of Army bachelor housing.

To achieve the goal of an all-volunteer force, the Army has vigorously pursued several tracks to improve the lot of the soldier. Troop housing is one of these and, as we all know, has needed considerable improvement. World War II barracks will no longer meet the requirement.

Since fiscal year 1972, the Congress has approved the expenditure of \$695 million to construct or modernize nearly 151,000 spaces in the Army's troop housing program. After completion of this fiscal year 1975 MCA program the Army will have attained over 75 percent of its

stated goal of providing adequate quarters for its bachelor personnel. Recent upward enlistments and retention statistics are beginning to show the validity of Army efforts to improve the attractiveness of military life with housing playing a major part. For example, through mid-June this year the Army enlisted over 180,000 volunteer men and women. In May the Army achieved over 103 percent of its recruiting objectives and through mid-June nearly 107 percent of its objectives. Reenlistment, a better barometer of Army improvement, shows that the Army achieved nearly 108 percent of its reenlistment goals through May.

Much progress has been made in properly housing our soldiers. There is still much to be done and this year's MCA program will continue the momentum. Secretary Callaway and the Army should be highly commended for the vigor with which they have pursued this most worthy program.

Mr. Chairman, I urge approval of the Army troop housing contained in the bill before you.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WHITE).

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment briefly in support of that portion of the Army's construction program which pertains to medical facilities. The fiscal year 1975 program represents a substantial increase over previous years—and for good reason—for it comprises the first major increment of the Army's accelerated health facilities modernization program. The modernization program is designed to replace inefficient and deteriorated facilities built during and prior to World War II, modernize and expand outmoded and overtaxed facilities of more recent origin, and construct new facilities where there are unsatisfied requirements.

The present request marks an admirable beginning to this ambitious program, directed toward providing modern, adequate health care facilities in support of the All-Volunteer Army. While the present request includes but one comparatively small replacement hospital, two major clinic additions are included, reflecting the Army's increasing need for outpatient treatment facilities. Not unlike the civilian sector, the Army has experienced a change in the relationship between inpatient and outpatient care in recent years. There is an increasing trend to treat patients in an outpatient status, thus increasing clinic requirements and reducing the need for additional bed space in many cases.

Also included in the request is a major item for electrical/mechanical upgrade of a number of existing hospitals. This is a requirement generated by the standards applied under the Occupational Safety and Health Act, more advanced standards for life safety now included in the most recent edition of National Fire Protection Association codes, technological advances, more stringent requirements of the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Hospitals, increased electrical requirements of hospitals, and

increased seismic protection required as a result of scientific reassessment of seismic zones in the United States and the degree of protection required for hospital structures.

For many years, military dentists have been operating in conditions and under constraints imposed by their physical plant environment which are considered unacceptable and inefficient in the civilian community. The present program includes a number of dental clinics to replace the old World War II wooden clinic structures with modern efficient designs. Both military and civilian dentists have long recognized the need for more than one dental chair per dentist to make the most efficient use of each dentist's time. The design of these new clinics will allow the dentist to operate in a multiple chair configuration, thereby increasing the numbers of dental procedures which can be performed. Upon completion of clinics in the program this year, a substantial deficit remains, Army-wide, to be accomplished during the remaining 4 years of the health facilities modernization program.

I believe this program constitutes a significant and desirable contribution to an essential element of the military construction program and commend it to you for your support.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. SCHROEDER).

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, basically I just want to thank the committee for the hard work it has done on this bill. I think the subject matter of this bill is one of the most thankless tasks the committee has. It is so laborious to take the time to go through each item.

Mr. Chairman, when we get to title II, I will be offering an amendment to delete Diego Garcia from the bill, which I think many Members have not heard of before. I just wanted to take this time to put the Members on notice that this will be coming up.

Some Members ask whether Diego Garcia is a private bill. No, it is an island in the middle of the Indian Ocean. We have \$32 million in the bill for expanding and building up the naval communication facilities which are already on Diego Garcia.

Therefore, I will be offering an amendment when we get to title II of the bill to eliminate this.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HEBERT).

Mr. HEBERT. Mr. Chairman, I merely rise to pay tribute to and compliment the subcommittee headed by the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIKE), and the members of his subcommittee. It is the action of such subcommittees as this headed by the Senator from New York (Mr. PIKE), and the diligence which the committee showed in bringing this bill before the House in record time, which makes the chairman of the full committee rest a little easier.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is also very significant that this is the only bill, since

I have been chairman of the committee, that was reported out of the committee without a dissenting vote. The vote was 34 to 0. No Member objected to the bill, all voted for it. I think this is a high compliment to those who served on that committee.

Mr. Chairman, I arise to address a few remarks to a special area of this year's military construction bill that is of particular interest to me and I believe will be to the whole body of the House.

Before proceeding with my remarks I wish to commend the distinguished gentleman from New York, Congressman OTIS PIKE, for the thorough, expeditious, and effective manner in which hearings were conducted this year.

My remarks will be related to the Trident weapons system facilities authorized under the Navy's portion of the bill. In fiscal year 1973, appropriations were provided for initiating planning and design and last year's authorization act provided \$118.3 million for initiating construction at the Trident support complex, Bangor, Wash., and the Air Force eastern test range, Cape Canaveral, Fla.

In the fiscal year 1975 program for Trident Support Site, Bangor, Wash., the committee approved \$95 million for facilities construction. The Trident project will provide construction or modification to a number of missile production and missile support buildings; the initial increment of the bachelor enlisted quarters; enlisted mess; Marine Corps berthing and associated administration buildings; fire station; facilities relocation—the Quality Engineering and Evaluation Laboratory—and the second phase of site improvement and utilities, and training facility.

The Trident system is planned as this country's sea based deterrent in future years to prevent a nuclear war or attempted nuclear blackmail. The system is being developed, in a highly defined and orderly manner to be available to supplant our present strategic forces as they become more vulnerable and technically obsolete. The Trident system will include a new submarine; quieter and more survivable than its predecessors, a new missile, of longer range than the Poseidon, and a shore support facility for both to be located at Bangor, Wash.

Our present fleet ballistic missile submarine fleet is supported from submarine tenders positioned at various locations overseas to eliminate the long transit time from U.S. bases that would be necessary with the current relatively short-range missiles. The increased range of the Trident missile, in addition to providing a greater operating area for the Trident submarine and thus greater survivability, allows us to support the Trident submarine from a shore facility located within the continental United States.

The shore facility will provide maintenance for the Trident submarine during off-patrol periods, production and maintenance capability for the Trident missile, and initial and refresher training for the crews of the Trident submarine. The availability and cost effectiveness of the Trident submarine is

optimized by this dedicated shore facility which will allow a reduction in time spent in port between patrols as well as up to 10 years of operations between shipyard overhauls. The availability of the Trident submarine force will be about 15 percent greater than that of the present FBM force. This greater availability, coupled with the fact that each submarine will carry more missiles, means that the cost of keeping a missile at sea on Trident is approximately half of the cost per missile at sea for Polaris and Poseidon, even including all development and acquisition costs.

Last year, \$118,320,000 was provided for a new wharf and turning basin and related facilities at Cape Canaveral for the development and flight test program of the Trident missile and for the facilities required earliest at the Bangor support site. The facilities at Bangor included a submarine maintenance pier, an explosive handling wharf, the first phase of the training building, site improvements, and utilities.

At Cape Canaveral, work on the wharf and dredging project commenced in March of this year with the start of dredging for the new turning basin. Construction of the wharf itself will start in September. Contracts were awarded in June for the work on modifying the Poseidon guidance/telemetry building and the missile assembly and checkout area to configurations to support Trident. The start of construction for modifications to launch complex has been delayed from July to September by a change in explosive safety criteria; however, this 2-month delay does not impact on the required availability date.

The Navy is continuing the planning for the Trident support site at Bangor, Wash. The preliminary master plan has been developed which, based on analysis of several alternatives, identifies a land use plan with general siting for all on-base and waterfront facilities. Design is underway for selected facilities; design criteria and detailed cost estimates are being developed for other projects. The preparation of the final master plan has begun. Concurrently a draft environmental impact statement—EIS—has been prepared addressing the construction and operation of the base. Public comments from individuals and organizations have been received during the public hearing held April 24 and 25, 1974, and during the public review period which ended on May 31, 1974. These comments were incorporated into the final environmental impact statement which was filed with the council on environmental quality on July 23, 1974. The Navy supported by the Office of Economic Adjustment within the Defense Department and other Federal agencies including the Office of Management and Budget are working closely with Washington State and county officials to address and mitigate the social-economic impacts identified in the Trident environmental impact statement. Necessary Federal assistance as identified is expected to be provided through the appropriate Federal agencies. The subcommittee added section 610 under the gen-

eral provisions to authorize the Secretary of Defense to assist counties and communities located near the Trident support site in Bangor, Wash., in meeting the cost of providing increased municipal services and facilities to the residents of such areas if it is determined there is substantial need for such services as a direct result of the Trident facility.

Industrial engineering analyses and engineering studies of individual facilities and functions at the site have continued. Additional reviews of explosive safety requirements have confirmed that existing naval ship repair installations cannot be used for Trident refits unless all missiles are offloaded. The time to offload and reload all missiles between patrols would reduce the percent of time at-sea-on-alert and therefore would reduce the cost effectiveness of the Trident system; the additional missile handling would also create safety hazards and degrade missile reliability.

Plans for the Trident support site will provide industrial facilities to refit submarines while missiles remain on board. This will reduce the off-patrol time and keep more missiles at sea. The capability to refit while carrying missiles could not be developed at existing naval ship repair activities.

Even though the Trident shore facilities represent only 5 percent of the total cost of the system, the facilities are vital to deployment and economic life cycle maintenance of the weapon system. The provision of this dedicated and integrated Trident support at a single site provides the most cost effective life cycle for the weapon system.

I strongly support this project and urge approval of the bill as reported so that construction may continue in an orderly manner to meet the initial operational capability date of late calendar year 1978.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Air Force request to provide additional aircraft shelters and associated hardened support facilities on various European bases. This item is a continuation of the theater airbase vulnerability reduction program—TAB VEE—that the Air Force initiated and Congress approved in fiscal year 1968.

The quickest and where possible, the most effective way of gaining air superiority is to destroy the enemy's aircraft on the ground. In this regard, congested airbases, when unprotected by anti-aircraft defenses, dispersal and camouflage, are highly vulnerable to low-flying enemy aircraft and insurgent attacks. Unsheltered aircraft on the ground can be destroyed by bombing, strafing, or napalm even in the face of heavy ground anti-aircraft and surface-to-air missile fire. In addition to direct hits, near misses, blast, shrapnel, fire, and sympathetic detonation can all cause unsheltered aircraft to be damaged or destroyed. Determined insurgents or a few aircraft in bombing or strafing passes can inflict widespread destruction to aircraft which

are not dispersed and sheltered. The merits of aircraft protective shelters, coupled with aggressive ground-based anti-aircraft defense, has been shown in the dramatic difference in the survival rates of the Egyptian Air Force in the 1967 war when its aircraft were destroyed on the ground, and the 1973 war when only an insignificant number of Egyptian and Arabian aircraft were destroyed on the ground. A major factor in this reversal of destruction was that in the 1973 conflict the Arabian aircraft were protected on the ground by hardened shelters that were surrounded by effective surface-to-air missiles and other anti-aircraft weapons. In light of this and our experience, it is prudent to look to the survival of the U.S. aircraft we have committed to the NATO mission. The \$92.3 million of funds provided in earlier programs by the Congress have sheltered every U.S. aircraft permanently based on the continent of Europe.

However, we do have commitments to send additional aircraft squadrons to NATO in the event of force mobilization. Should the Warsaw Pact nations initiate an attack on Western Europe using conventional weapons, as opposed to a surprise attack with nuclear armed missiles, there will be sufficient warning to NATO by troop movements, materiel stockage, and other unusual actions to allow a reactive NATO mobilization. U.S. aircraft that we are committed to deploy to NATO during a mobilization would have no shelters at their assigned bases, and would be extremely vulnerable to destruction by conventional weapons even with dispersal, camouflage, and vigorous anti-aircraft defense.

The aircraft shelter, when coupled with a strong anti-aircraft defense, is probably the most effective measure for improving aircraft survivability. It forces the attacker to consider each shelter as a target whether or not it houses an aircraft. This strategy requires a commitment of one sortie for each shelter and exposes his aircraft to heavy attrition from defensive firepower while reducing our risk to a minimum.

To keep the momentum that the United States has generated in the shelter program, to provide a visible deterrent to potential enemies, and to protect our aircraft should hostilities occur, the shelter program should proceed. The merits of shelters have been recognized in NATO and the other NATO countries have in being, and under construction, protective aircraft shelters that provide for the major portion of their forces. The shelters in this request will protect a portion of the rapid reaction aircraft and are designed to accommodate the full gamut of U.S. tactical fighters including the new F-15, A-10, and F-111.

Construction of these shelters by direct NATO funding would delay their completion for at least 15 months. The Defense Department will take the necessary action to secure the maximum possible recoupment from NATO for this \$62 million prefinanced program.

In conclusion, it should be noted that the net U.S. outlay to shelter those com-

bat fighter aircraft which would be deployed under various contingency situations, is approximately 1 percent of the value of the aircraft protected. I feel this is a sound investment to pay for increasing the survivability of our tactical aircraft.

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding and request permission to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. Chairman, in considering the military construction authorization, H.R. 16137, now before us, the Armed Services Committee has authorized \$7.1 million for renovation and an addition to the gymnasium at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point.

The initial request for this worthy project was \$9.1 million, the committee having reduced that request by \$2.1 million. While improving the antiquated gymnasium facilities at West Point warrants the full requested funding, the \$7.1 million authorized by the committee, if it is not further reduced by the Appropriations Committee, should be sufficient to make most of the changes necessary for modernizing the existing structure.

Having personally visited the present gymnasium facilities at the Academy, I am convinced that it is inadequate, antiquated, and a health hazard. It was originally built to accommodate 2,700 cadets but is now utilized by almost twice that number.

Recognizing that the physical fitness of our cadets is of great importance to the training of our Nation's future military leaders, we have always encouraged our military academies to foster rigorous physical education programs. Since the major portion of the West Point gymnasium was constructed almost 65 years ago, with only minor alterations and additions completed in 1935, 1947, and 1970, this facility is totally inadequate for the needs of the growing West Point community.

A priority project anticipated by the Academy is the renovation of the ventilation system in the gym. An appraisal of the existing ventilation system reveals that in the boxing and wrestling areas, there is no provision for fresh air. Additionally, the present system is only capable of recirculating the stale air, creating an unpleasant and unhealthy atmosphere.

Mr. Chairman, in addition to the urgent need for improving the facility at West Point, there is another, equally important reason for early funding of this project. The depressed economic climate of the region surrounding West Point, particularly in the building and construction trades, stresses the need for increased activity in that industry. With several thousand building and construction workers currently unemployed in the greater West Point area, the deteriorating status of the economy in that region is threatening. Accordingly, early approval of the renovation and addition to the existing gymnasium facilities at

West Point will not only provide needed physical expansion for the U.S.M.A. but will also be a boon to our sorely affected construction industry.

Mr. Chairman, while the full \$9.1 million funding would have been a more adequate response to the needs of the Academy's physical fitness program, I recognize the necessity of tightening the reins on our Nation's pursestrings during this critical economic period, and willingly accept the Committee's authorization of \$7.1 million, provided it is not further reduced.

Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, in the interests of enhancing the physical fitness program at the U.S. Military Academy, I urge my colleagues to support this proposal authorizing an early funding of the West Point gymnasium project.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I notice that in addition to the gymnasium at West Point, there are already 839 military swimming pools in the United States. I wonder if any of those are in the gentleman's district.

Mr. GILMAN. Not that I know of. I am not requesting any swimming pool. I am concerned about an antiquated gymnasium at West Point. West Point has recently doubled its cadet personnel. The existing 65-year-old gymnasium was built to serve one-half the size of the academy's present personnel. The Academy has outgrown this facility.

Mr. STARK. Would the addition of that gymnasium accommodate female cadets at West Point?

Mr. GILMAN. I would hope that it would, for I favor admission of women to our service academies.

Mr. STARK. I thank the gentleman for that, and ask him to yield for just a moment more.

I note that the bill also contains 289 maintenance funds for golf courses in the United States. I wonder if the gentleman knows whether or not those golf courses are sufficiently severe to challenge the members of our Armed Forces to sharpen their eyes for the very difficult job they may have of defending us.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, while I am not aware of any of those golf courses being provided for any military installation in my own region, I am certain that the Armed Services Committee has given appropriate attention to the concern expressed by the gentleman from California.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the gentleman from Virginia will yield a couple of minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WHITEHURST. I will be glad to.

Mr. PIKE. First of all, I cannot let stand on the record the statement that there are 839 swimming pools in this bill, because there are not 839 swimming pools in this bill.

I think there are only 700 line items, in total, in this bill. Therefore, somewhere along the line the gentleman from California got some very bad statistics. I

just hate to have very bad statistics spread on the record.

One just cannot have more swimming pools in the bill than there are line items. We are building airfields and shelters and barracks, and we are building all kinds of things all over the United States of America and all over the rest of the world.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. RANDALL.)

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 16136, the military construction authorization. I think the chairman of the subcommittee hit the nail on the head when he said in the well a moment ago that the best measure of the worth and merit of this bill is that he has received complaints from both sides, first, from those who felt they had not received enough authorization, and also complaints from some who believed these complaints had received too much.

Now let me answer the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) who is worried about swimming pools and golf courses. First there was no request for a single golf course, and there never has ever been a single request or authorization. These are all built with nonappropriated funds. Next about the swimming pools—one was requested—note, only one and no more than that and it was rejected. These are the facts and that should put to sleep these false reports or rumors.

All of the line items in this bill, are necessary and essential and many are sorely needed. True, there is not enough housing provided, but this is a time for austerity because of inflation.

If I may be pardoned for being provincial I can attest to the need for a flight control facility at Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base in our district which is needed as a safety measure. Then throughout the bill are numerous hospitals much like the one at Whiteman Air Force Base in our district.

The subcommittee approved a project that will replace three obsolete buildings.

In this bill there is a \$6 million project for a composite medical facility at Whiteman Air Force Base. There is nothing extravagant about this. This is only a 30-bed facility and it is not only too small even before it is built. It does contain some very badly needed outpatient clinic space and 18 dental treatment rooms. This facility is needed most because it is required to satisfy the medical needs around this Air Force base where retirees have chosen to make this their permanent home. At present medical and dental requirements exceed the space of the facilities. As it is now there are only three buildings. They are all obsolete. Inpatient care space is needed. It is too crowded at present and out-patient space is even more crowded. It has been noted that the present facilities are approximately only one half of the area that should be allotted. Surely, the time has come to provide this necessary medical care for our airmen and their dependents.

Before I sit down, Mr. Chairman, I

wish to say a word in support of the funds for the Navy base at Diego Garcia in the Indian Ocean. I am opposed to deletion of any of these funds. This is an item of construction of utmost strategic importance. One has only to look at the map to prove that if we do not proceed to work on this base we might just as well turn over the Indian Ocean, to the ships and the submarines that carry the insignia of the Red Star.

Mr. Chairman, the hour is late. Any one of us who doubts that the Soviets control this area, had better revise their thinking. We need Diego Garcia now.

Finally let me commend the chairman and all the members of the committee. They have worked many, many hours. There is no reason why this military construction bill should not be regarded as one of the very best that has ever been presented to the House. It should just be adopted without amendment.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from Missouri yield?

Mr. RANDALL. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. CARTER. I rise in support of what the gentleman from Missouri has said, and I want to associate myself with his remarks.

I realize and we all should realize that if we visit the military hospitals outside of this country and in this country, they are not in the state that they should be in. They should be improved.

The Armed Forces of our country deserve the very best that the country can give them. During wartime we do not hesitate to demand much, but this is the time when we are really putting them on the back burner, so to speak.

They deserve our support, and I want to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Missouri for his remarks.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote against this military construction authorization, H.R. 16136, just as I voted against the military appropriation, the agricultural appropriation, the legislative appropriation, the State, Commerce, and Justice appropriations, and other bills which represent huge increases every year without significant new programs.

Inflation is raging. We ought to be holding it back. Instead we spend as if money were going out of style. My vote will be a lonely one, and it is no reflection on the fine committee that handled the bill, but I believe it is an important one.

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment to strike funds for Diego Garcia. We are asked to approve a mere \$29 million to turn a communications facility into a naval base. But the implication of this mild request is staggering. It is nothing less than a redirection of our foreign policy, by the Pentagon.

Shapers of foreign policy in both executive and legislative branches have always regarded the Indian Ocean as low priority in terms of national security, by contrast with the Atlantic, Pacific, and Mediterranean oceans. We have kept a

low profile there and so has the Soviet Union. The states bordering on the Indian Ocean have the long-term objective of making it a zone of peace, freedom, and neutrality.

Last May our Assistant Secretary of State, Joseph Sisco, observed that "our interests there are marginal." In 1972, as Secretary of Defense, Melvin Laird defined our strength there as "not so much in maintaining a large standing force * * * but rather in our ability to move freely in and out of the ocean."

On August 1, William Colby, the director of the CIA, testified that the Soviet presence in that ocean is not a military threat and will not be unless the Soviets feel compelled to match an American buildup. Despite all this, Secretary Schlesinger with messianic fervor to resume the role of world policeman upholds the Navy's request to start building a major base.

Actually, the Navy appears to have had this ambition for some time. A secret search for new bases resulted in the choice of Diego Garcia, because it could be expanded into a major service base for submarines and B-52's. In 1966 the island was made available to the United States through the cooperation of Britain. Periodic patrols of Polaris and Poseidon submarines were possible because of the communications facility established there.

According to retired Rear Adm. Gene LaRocque, the next step in the creation of an infrastructure for increased naval deployment is the development of a supply and repair base in the Indian Ocean. That is what we are now being asked to approve.

The Navy has already received \$6 million for dredging the harbor to accommodate submarines and aircraft carriers. Reconnaissance aircraft and a submarine tender for servicing nuclear submarines may soon be sent there.

And at that point we begin a naval race with the Soviet Union. The surrounding countries are alarmed. New Zealand and Indonesia have already raised questions about our intentions, and Australia has called on the Soviets and the United States to "exercise mutual restraint."

According to expert testimony, we already have overall naval superiority. We can quickly move sizable forces into the region if some emergency should arise. That is highly unlikely, however. A reopened Suez Canal could as quickly be closed again, leaving the Soviets vulnerable without support facilities. There is no indication, either, that the Soviets intend to interfere with the shipment of oil from the Persian Gulf. Oil could more easily be "turned off at the wellhead" in the Middle East before being shipped.

What then is the purpose of this planned expansion? Some suggest that it is to keep the Navy at present strength and growing, to fill the gap left by the pullout from Asia. If this is the real intent, it is a very dangerous gamble, and one which the House should not approve.

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will read the bill by titles.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I

SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following acquisition and construction:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

UNITED STATES ARMY FORCES COMMAND
Fort Bragg, North Carolina, \$26,170,000.
Fort Campbell, Kentucky, \$9,742,000.
Fort Carson, Colorado, \$27,731,000.
Fort Hood, Texas, \$40,214,000.
Fort Sam Houston, Texas, \$4,286,000.
Fort Lewis, Washington, \$10,270,000.
Fort Riley, Kansas, \$24,478,000.
Fort Stewart/Hunter Army Airfield, Georgia, \$42,197,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY TRAINING AND DOCTRINE COMMAND

Fort Belvoir, Virginia, \$9,031,000.
Fort Benning, Georgia, \$36,827,000.
Fort Bliss, Texas, \$13,704,000.
Fort Eustis, Virginia, \$9,288,000.
Fort Gordon, Georgia, \$9,625,000.
Hunter-Liggett Military Reservation, California, \$1,108,000.
Fort Jackson, South Carolina, \$19,078,000.
Fort Knox, Kentucky, \$2,264,000.
Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, \$9,911,000.
Fort Lee, Virginia, \$5,218,000.
Fort McClellan, Alabama, \$17,344,000.
Presidio of Monterey, California, \$3,107,000.
Fort Ord, California, \$3,660,000.
Fort Polk, Louisiana, \$7,304,000.
Fort Rucker, Alabama, \$4,928,000.
Fort Sill, Oklahoma, \$15,587,000.
Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, \$3,360,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY MILITARY DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

Fort Myer, Virginia, \$2,497,000.
UNITED STATES ARMY MATERIEL COMMAND
Aeronautical Maintenance Center, Texas, \$541,000.
Anniston Army Depot, Alabama, \$7,648,000.
Letterkenny Army Depot, Pennsylvania, \$4,726,000.
Lexington/Blue Grass Army Depot, Kentucky, \$616,000.
Picatinny Arsenal, New Jersey, \$2,820,000.
Red River Army Depot, Texas, \$269,000.
Redstone Arsenal, Alabama, \$10,322,000.
Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois, \$2,731,000.
Sacramento Army Depot California, \$2,599,000.
Seneca Army Depot, New York, \$815,000.
Sierra Army Depot, California, \$717,000.
Watervliet Arsenal, New York, \$3,256,000.
White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico, \$1,542,000.
Yuma Proving Ground, Arizona, \$1,859,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY COMMUNICATION COMMAND

Fort Huachuca, Arizona, \$3,399,000.
Fort Ritchie, Maryland, \$2,023,000.

UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

United States Military Academy, West Point, New York, \$7,720,000.

HEALTH SERVICES COMMAND

Fort Detrick, Maryland, \$486,000.
Various Locations, \$16,600,000.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Cold Regions Laboratories, New Hampshire, \$2,515,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY, ALASKA

Fort Greely, Alaska, \$251,000.
Fort Richardson, Alaska, \$1,732,000.
Fort Wainwright, Alaska, \$11,473,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY, HAWAII

Schofield Barracks, Hawaii, \$15,324,000.
Tripler General Hospital, Hawaii, \$1,205,000.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

Various Locations, Air Pollution Abatement, \$1,356,000.
Various Locations, Water Pollution Abatement, \$16,358,000.

DINING FACILITIES MODERNIZATION

Various Locations, \$10,723,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

UNITED STATES ARMY FORCES, SOUTHERN COMMAND
Canal Zone, Various Locations, \$324,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY, PACIFIC

Korea, Various Locations, \$1,663,000.

KWAJALEIN MISSILE RANGE

National Missile Range, \$1,272,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY SECURITY AGENCY
Various Locations, \$148,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY COMMUNICATION COMMAND

Fort Buckner, Okinawa, \$532,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY, EUROPE

Germany, Various Locations, \$25,000,000.
Camp Darby, Italy, \$4,159,000.

Various Locations: For the United States share of the cost of multilateral programs for the acquisition or construction of military facilities and installations, including international military headquarters, for the collective defense of the North Atlantic Treaty Area, \$88,000,000: *Provided*, That, within thirty days after the end of each quarter, the Secretary of the Army shall furnish to the Committee on Armed Services and on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives a description of obligations incurred as the United States share of such multilateral programs.

SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop Army installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Army missions and responsibilities which have been occasioned by: (1) unforeseen security considerations, (2) new weapons developments, (3) new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or (4) improved production schedules if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next Military Construction Authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment; in the total amount of \$10,000,000; *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire upon enactment of the fiscal year 1976 Military Construction Authorization Act except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

SEC. 103. (a) Public Law 93-166 is amended under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES—UNITED STATES ARMY EUROPE," in section 101 as follows:

With respect to "Germany, Various Locations" strike out "\$12,517,000" and insert in place thereof "\$16,360,000."

(b) Public Law 93-166 is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 602 "107,257,000" and "\$596,084,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$111,100,000" and "\$599,927,000," respectively.

SEC. 104. (a) Public Law 92-545, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES," in section 101 as follows:

With respect to "Fort Myer, Virginia," strike out "\$1,815,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,615,000."

With respect to "Fort Still, Oklahoma," strike out "\$14,958,000" and insert in place thereof "\$16,159,000."

(b) Public Law 92-545, as amended, is amended under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES—UNITED STATES ARMY FORCES, SOUTHERN COMMAND" in section 101 as follows:

With respect to "Canal Zone, Various Locations" strike out "\$8,129,000" and insert in place thereof "\$9,238,000."

(c) Public Law 92-545, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 702 "\$444,767,000;" "\$117,311,000;" and "\$562,078,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$447,768,000;" "\$118,420,000;" and "\$566,188,000" respectively.

SEC. 105. (a) Public Law 91-511, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES," in section 101 as follows:

With respect to "Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois," strike out "\$2,750,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,650,000."

(b) Public Law 91-511, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 602 "\$181,834,000" and "\$267,031,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$182,734,000" and "\$267,831,000," respectively.

SEC. 106. Public Law 93-166 is amended in section 105 as follows:

Public Law 93-166, section 105(b), amending Public Law 92-145, section 702, clause (1) as amended, having inserted erroneous figures, is amended by striking out "\$404,500,000" and "\$405,107,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$405,000,000" and "\$405,607,000," respectively.

Mr. PIKE (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title I be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II

SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment for the following acquisition and construction:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

FIRST NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine, \$261,000.

Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, Kittery, Maine, \$2,332,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Winter Harbor, Maine, \$255,000.

Naval Education and Training Center, Newport, Rhode Island, \$2,582,000.

THIRD NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut, \$2,354,000.

FOURTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Air Test Facility, Lakehurst, New Jersey, \$7,350,000.

Naval Hospital, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, \$296,000.

NAVAL DISTRICT, WASHINGTON

Naval District Commandant, Washington, District of Columbia, \$2,883,000.

Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, District of Columbia, \$205,000.

Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland, \$1,256,000.

National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Maryland, \$14,943,000.

Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences, Bethesda, Maryland, \$15,000,000.

FIFTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Regional Medical Center, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, \$290,000.

Naval Air Rework Facility, Cherry Point, North Carolina, \$252,000.

Fleet Combat Direction Systems Training Center, Atlantic, Dam Neck, Virginia, \$2,034,000.

Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek, Virginia, \$896,000.

Atlantic Command Operations Control Center, Norfolk, Virginia, \$633,000.

Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Virginia, \$2,900,000.

Naval Station, Norfolk, Virginia, \$8,364,000.

Naval Supply Center, Norfolk, Virginia, \$4,990,000.

Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia, \$1,047,000.

Norfolk Naval Regional Medical Center, Portsmouth, Virginia, \$15,801,000.

Norfolk Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, Virginia, \$5,602,000.

Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia, \$3,438,000.

SIXTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Florida, \$6,893,000.

Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida, \$446,000.

Naval Regional Medical Center, Jacksonville, Florida, \$12,413,000.

Naval Station, Mayport, Florida, \$3,239,000.

Naval Training Center, Orlando, Florida, \$4,569,000.

Naval Coastal Systems Laboratory, Panama City, Florida, \$620,000.

Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida, \$20,948,000.

Naval Technical Training Center, Pensacola, Florida, \$4,478,000.

Naval Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida, \$1,561,000.

Naval Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi, \$1,485,000.

Naval Hospital, Beaufort, South Carolina, \$7,112,000.

Charleston Naval Shipyard, Charleston, South Carolina, \$200,000.

Naval Station, Charleston, South Carolina, \$15,352,000.

Naval Supply Center, Charleston, South Carolina, \$3,750,000.

Naval Weapons Station, Charleston, South Carolina, \$2,564,000.

Naval Air Station, Memphis, Tennessee, \$4,284,000.

EIGHTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Support Activity, New Orleans, Louisiana, \$3,080,000.

Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi, Texas, \$1,830,000.

Naval Air Station, Kingsville, Texas, \$1,428,000.

NINTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois, \$10,164,000.

ELEVENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Regional Medical Center, Camp Pendleton, California, \$10,021,000.

Naval Weapons Center, China Lake, California, \$8,371,000.

Long Beach Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California, \$6,011,000.

Naval Air Station, Miramar, California, \$11,354,000.

Naval Air Station, North Island, California, \$12,050,000.

Naval Construction Battalion Center, Port Hueneme, California, \$1,048,000.

Naval Electronics Laboratory Center, San Diego, California, \$3,238,000.

Naval Regional Medical Center, San Diego, California, \$26,375,000.

Navy Submarine Support Facility, San Diego, California, \$4,234,000.

Naval Weapons Station, Seal Beach, California, \$2,147,000.

TWELFTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Air Rework Facility, Alameda, California, \$1,638,000.

Naval Hospital, Lemoore, California, \$333,000.

Naval Air Station, Moffett Field, California, \$77,000.

THIRTEENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Station, Adak, Alaska, \$4,605,000.

TRIDENT Support Site, Bangor, Washington, \$95,000,000.

Puget Sound Naval Shipyard Bremerton, Washington, \$393,000.

Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Washington, \$2,201,000.

FOURTEENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Ammunition Depot, Oahu, Hawaii, \$795,000.

Naval Station, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, \$1,505,000.

Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, \$3,356,000.

MARINE CORPS

Marine Barracks, Washington, District of Columbia, \$1,874,000.

Marine Corps Development and Education Command, Quantico, Virginia, \$2,803,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, \$13,864,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina, \$1,260,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, New River, North Carolina, \$499,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Yuma, Arizona, \$3,203,000.

Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, California, \$1,463,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California, \$7,271,000.

Marine Corps Base, Twentynine Palms, California, \$3,076,600.

Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Hawaii, \$5,497,000.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

Various Locations, Air Pollution Abatement, \$9,849,000.

Various Locations, Water Pollution Abatement, \$44,251,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

TENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Telecommunications Center, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico, \$3,186,000.

Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico, \$947,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Sabana Seca, Puerto Rico, \$1,026,000.

FIFTEENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Support Activity, Canal Zone, \$800,000.

ATLANTIC OCEAN AREA

Naval Air Station, Bermuda, \$1,866,000.
Naval Station, Keflavik, Iceland, \$2,317,000.

EUROPEAN AREA

Naval Security Group Activity, Edzell, Scotland, \$571,000.
Naval Activities Detachment, Holy Loch, Scotland, \$1,188,000.

INDIAN OCEAN AREA

Naval Communications Facility, Diego Garcia, Chagos Archipelago, \$29,000,000.

PACIFIC OCEAN AREA

Naval Communication Station, Finegayan, Guam, Mariana Islands, \$355,000.
Navy Public Works Center, Guam, Mariana Islands, \$907,000.
Naval Air Station, Cubi Point, Republic of the Philippines, \$4,052,000.
Naval Hospital, Subic Bay, Republic of the Philippines, \$278,000.
Naval Station, Subic Bay, Republic of the Philippines, \$3,741,000.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

Various Locations, Air Pollution Abatement, \$1,059,000.
Various Locations, Water Pollution Abatement, \$4,038,000.

SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop Navy installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Navy missions and responsibilities which have been occasioned by (1) unforeseen security considerations, (2) new weapons developments, (3) new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or (4) improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next Military Construction Authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of \$10,000,000; *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire upon enactment of the fiscal year 1976 Military Construction Authorization Act, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

SEC. 203. (a) Public Law 90-408, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES," in section 201 as follows:

With respect to "Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland," strike out "\$2,000,000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,391,000."

(b) Public Law 90-408, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 802 "\$241,668,000" and "\$248,533,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$244,059,000" and "\$250,924,000," respectively.

SEC. 204. (a) Public Law 91-511, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES," in section 201 as follows:

With respect to "Naval Air Rework Facility, Jacksonville, Florida," strike out "\$3,869,000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,534,000."

(b) Public Law 91-511, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 602 "\$247,204,000" and "\$274,342,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$247,869,000" and "\$275,007,000," respectively.

SEC. 205. (a) Public Law 92-545, as amended,

is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES," in section 201 as follows:

With respect to "Navy Public Works Center, Norfolk, Virginia," strike out "\$3,319,000" and insert in place thereof "\$7,019,000."

With respect to "Naval Hospital, New Orleans, Louisiana," strike out "\$11,680,000" and insert in place thereof "\$14,609,000."

(b) Public Law 92-545, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 702 "\$477,664,000" and "\$518,881,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$484,293,000" and "\$525,510,000," respectively.

SEC. 206. (a) Public Law 93-166 is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES," in section 201 as follows:

With respect to "Naval Home, Gulfport, Mississippi," strike out "\$9,444,000" and insert in place thereof "\$14,163,000."

With respect to "Naval Hospital, New Orleans, Louisiana," strike out "\$3,386,000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,157,000."

With respect to "Naval Air Station, Alameda, California," strike out "\$3,827,000" and insert in place thereof "\$7,756,000."

With respect to "Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, California," strike out "\$3,802,000" and insert in place thereof "\$6,210,000."

(b) Public Law 93-166 is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 602 "\$511,606,000" and "\$570,439,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$523,433,000" and "\$552,266,000," respectively.

Mr. PIKE (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title II of the bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MRS. SCHROEDER

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer two amendments, one amendment to title II and one amendment to title III, and I ask unanimous consent that they may be considered en bloc since they concern the same subject matter.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mrs. SCHROEDER: Page 15, strike lines 24 and 25.

Page 26, line 6, strike "\$8,100,000," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "\$4,800,000, provided that no funds authorized under this section shall be expended for construction of facilities at Diego Garcia Naval Installation, Indian Ocean."

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, basically these two amendments considered together would delete \$32,300,000 that is to be used to improve and expand the naval communication facilities and aircraft accommodations located at Diego Garcia, which is a British protectorate in the Indian Ocean.

I am asking at this time that the committee consider deleting these funds, for several different reasons, and I would like to list them:

First of all, as I understand it, Great Britain has not yet finally agreed to the improvements and expansion.

Second, these plans are not new. The Navy has had these plans on hand since the early 1960's.

Third, we have no known military commitments that have been explained

to us as to why we require the expansion right now.

Fourth, our military allies in the area have not really been pushing us very hard to come in there, and, in fact, they are a little bit queasy about our moving in in any greater numbers or force. Some of our NATO allies such as France have also expressed concern. They wish we would hold back a while and consider this a little longer.

Some of the nonaligned nations have been showing a little concern about what we would be doing with the air base on the island. They have some fears that we might use it as a B-52 base and expand the aircraft servicing facilities and Vietnam haunts them.

Mr. Chairman, I think one of the main reasons I brought this matter up again today, is in the Senate the Committee on Armed Services has new testimony dealing with this subject. As the Members probably know, the CIA chief, Mr. Colby, appeared before the Committee on Armed Services in the Senate on the matter of Diego Garcia. He was the first person to appear counter to the Navy position. Much of his testimony was classified but the sanitized version was put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Senator SYMINGTON on August 1. In the sanitized version it came across very clearly that Mr. Colby felt we did not need to increase the facilities on Diego Garcia at this time because of the Soviet threat. The CIA, Mr. Colby's agency is the agency which supposedly monitors the Soviet threat, not the Navy. Colby stated that the CIA felt that the Soviet threat at that time was not so critical that we should move ahead with this expansion with great deliberate speed.

The senior Senator from my State, Senator DOMINICK, appeared at these hearings, and he specifically asked Mr. Colby whether the enlargement of the technical facilities was necessary, and if we did not enlarge them, would the Russians increase their naval forces.

Mr. Colby said, no, he did not think the Soviets would respond, that they have had a tradition of responding only when we reacted first. The precedents that were cited were the Pakistani war, where the Russians sent in no additional naval forces until the British had first sent in a carrier, and the Israeli or Mediterranean flare-up we had recently, where the Soviets did not send in any additional naval forces until we had first dispatched the carrier *Enterprise* into the area.

Mr. Chairman, what are we talking about? The Members have all seen the Defense Department map out in the hallway, and it makes it look as though the Russians have us in their jaws, but let us really talk about what we are considering. What do the Soviets have in the Indian Ocean?

What is this great Soviet threat that we are being asked to spend \$33 million to prepare a defense against?

In 1973 they had five surface ships, one diesel submarine, and six auxiliary support ships in the Indian Ocean. Today they have increased their surface ships by one. They now have six surface ships.

These are small, none of them are large. They still have one diesel submarine. The only major increase has been in mine sweepers. They have increased the number of mine sweepers in the area to nine, because they have been trying to clean out the Suez Canal.

Mr. Colby, from the CIA, stated that he feels that the Soviet presence in the India Ocean will increase only by one to two surface combatant ships per year at the present level, and based upon CIA observations of what has gone on before.

Further, 25 percent of the Soviet ships in that area tend to be just cruising from the Pacific territory over into the western ocean.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mrs. SCHROEDER was allowed to proceed for one additional minute.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, in summary, I think what Mr. Colby presented—and I wish all of the Members would read it because the CIA explains a very serious situation coupled with Admiral Zumwalt's testimony, that we are now no longer the No. 1 ocean power; one wonders whether we should spread ourselves any thinner and extend our lines even further, when there appears to be no imminent Soviet threat according to the CIA. Further, the CIA says if we go ahead with Diego Garcia plans we might trigger the escalation of the Soviet threat in that area.

I think a lot of the people think that the sun never sets on an American commitment. Especially since this expansion has not been fully authorized by the British, this would be a good thing to hold back on, and study more thoroughly. I really do not believe that one Russian diesel submarine, six surface combatant ships, and a few minesweepers are any threat to the American people in this country.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. SCHROEDER).

Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the distinguished gentlewoman from Colorado for her discussion of Diego Garcia. But I disagree.

I am amazed that so many have expressed concern that a refueling station of limited capacity—which obviously is needed by the U.S. Navy in the Indian Ocean—would trigger a U.S. arms race with the Soviets.

First of all, I should think we should be concerned with our own requirements. I cannot comprehend this tender regard for the sensibilities of the Soviets. They look after their interests; we should look after ours. The proposal to drop Diego Garcia would not affect Russia's plans. They already are in the Indian Ocean in force. Does not Congress know the facts? Everyone else does. The Soviets have constructed a major naval base in Somalia—on the horn of Africa. It commands the approaches to the Red Sea and the Suez. They are in South Yemen.

They have a base in Iraq. They still are operating out of Bangladesh.

The Russians have over four times as many combatant and support naval ships as we have in the Indian Ocean. We maintain a token force in Behran, but we have been told to get out because we are too friendly to Israel. There are but few places in all the Indian Ocean where we are allowed to buy fuel.

Perhaps you would like some comparisons. In 1968 the U.S. forces had 1,786 ship days in the Indian Ocean. The Soviets had 1,765. In 1973 the United States had 1,550 ship days in that area; the Soviets 8,544. Ours went down. Theirs expanded nearly five times. That should tell you all you need to know about Soviet intentions in the Indian Ocean.

I have seen a "Dear Colleague" letter which indicates the CIA does not feel concern about Soviet naval activities in the Indian Ocean. It just happens that I have access to the CIA, too. I presume that I am briefed about as frequently by the CIA as anyone else in the House. The information I have from CIA is diametrically opposed to what you have been told.

If we fail to develop this capability now we run the risk of being unable to respond to threats to our national interest because of our inability to support deployed forces there. We had serious problems providing support during the October war. We had to transport fuel all the way from the Philippines—4,000 miles away.

The Suez Canal soon will be reopened. It will not benefit U.S. naval forces but it will provide the Soviets with a far shorter route from the Indian Ocean to the Black Sea, and will enhance considerably their surge capability to position naval forces in the vital Arabian Sea/Persian Gulf area.

Do you want to see our ships stand idle and helpless because they run out of fuel during a crisis in the Indian Ocean? It could happen.

There are American interests throughout that part of the world: millions and millions in investments. Arab oil which is essential to our friends in Europe and badly needed by us.

You are being told that strong objections have been raised by other nations. I have seen no authentication for these statements.

We have a 50-year agreement with Britain for the use of Diego Garcia with the option for renewal. There is nothing to indicate serious concern by the new government in Britain. They want specific information on our plans. They have said that they will review all their military commitments. All new governments do this. No serious concern.

I have been informed in recent days by highest U.S. authority that some foreign governments say they have to object publicly to some extent to military build-ups in order to appease the more liberal elements in their country, but in reality they expect the United States to go ahead on Diego Garcia. There are just as many who want us to go ahead. And that is what we should do without further delay.

The funds in the bill are virtually all

that are considered to be required in the foreseeable future for our forces in Diego Garcia.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to announce to the gentleman in the well and the Members present that we have a new Commander in Chief as of right now, and a new President.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I would say the new Commander in Chief picked a significant time to be sworn in—while I have the floor and while the House debates the Nation defense. We all wish him well in his monumental task and our prayers are with him.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to rise in opposition to this amendment to bring my thoughts to the Members on this matter. As a member of the Committee on Armed Services we discussed this issue quite thoroughly.

We discussed this quite thoroughly, and it is my belief, from the information I have had that the Soviet Union began continuous naval operations in the Indian Ocean in 1968. It has bases on Socotra Island in the ocean and at nearby Aden, as well as easy access to port facilities in India and elsewhere. The Russians have no active combat troops in the ocean, but their force there is believed to include 1 large destroyer, 1 escort, 2 mine sweepers, 1 submarine, and 10 support ships, along with 4 or 5 mine sweepers and support ships based in Chittagong, Bangladesh.

By contrast, the United States is now represented by a single amphibious command ship and two destroyers, supplemented from time to time with carrier task forces from other areas.

I believe the United States must establish a genuinely counterbalancing naval force in an area that controls the sea lanes to Middle Eastern oil. Without a presence in the Indian Ocean, without fuel and repair facilities, without logistic support in the third largest ocean in the world, the United States would forfeit a large share of its naval position to the Russians. There is continuing concern that the British and American presence in Asia as a whole is leaving a vacuum that the Russians are intent upon filling.

In recent conversation with some of the Iranian military people, they tell me West Afghanistan and Afghanistan itself is bristling now with Soviet military hardware. They have had a coup in their government which is nothing but a puppet government for the Soviets. So there is no sense in hiding the idea, as the Iranian military people have said, that the Russians are wanting a corridor to the Indian Ocean through these two countries whenever they wish to do so in the near future.

Admiral Zumwalt, the U.S. Naval Chief of Operations recently testified that—

Events such as the Arab-Israeli war, the oil embargo and ensuing price rises show that our interests in the Indian Ocean are directly linked with our interests in Europe and Asia and, more broadly, with our fundamental interest in maintaining a stable, worldwide balance of power.

The implication is that a Diego Garcia base would make a specific difference to U.S. defense capabilities.

More importantly, the base would reduce U.S. dependence on Subic Bay in the Philippines, 5,000 miles away, for any action in the Indian Ocean. During the Bangladesh war it took the U.S. aircraft carrier *Enterprise* 7 days to sail from the Pacific to enter the ocean. From Diego Garcia, a ship could reach any port in the area within 48 hours.

More generally, experience has shown that a heavy U.S. presence has a tempering effect on nations locked in conflict and makes easier the big power task of containing local conflicts.

For this reason, Mr. Chairman, I would hope this amendment would be voted down.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado to strike these funds for Diego Garcia.

The significance of this money is far in excess of the \$30 some million that are involved. The fact is that if we vote for these funds we will be establishing for the first time a major U.S. military presence in an area of the world where we have heretofore had a low military posture and profile. An expansion of this base would give us a new capability in a region of the world where every significant Soviet military move in recent years has been in response to something that we have done originally.

I am persuaded that there are several good reasons for deferring action on this request at this time and for keeping the expansion of the facilities at Diego Garcia under review.

We have had comments today about the extent of the bases of the Soviets in the Indian Ocean area. Two that are mentioned most frequently are Socotra and Berbera in Somalia. Mr. Colby in his report says this about Socotra:

The barren island has no port facilities or fuel storage and its airstrip is a small World War II gravel runway.

With regard to the base in Somalia he says that there are no repair facilities ashore. They do have a small communications facility there.

One of the reasons we ought to oppose the money for Diego Garcia is that we should seek to avoid a naval arms race competition in this part of the world. It is the assessment of many of the experts, including the CIA, that Diego Garcia and the expansion of that base could have the effect of escalating naval competition in that part of the world.

In response to questions asked on the Senate side, Mr. Colby testified:

I think our assessment is that the Soviets would match any increase in our presence in the area.

The implication of that remark simply is that if we go in here and expand our facilities, then the Soviets will do likewise and we will be launched upon an arms race in a part of the world that has heretofore been free of military competition between the super powers. Our

expansion in Diego Garcia is going to attract like a magnet the Soviet presence in that area of the world.

The second reason we can support the amendment of the gentlewoman from Colorado is because deferring action on this will have no adverse impact on the position of the United States in the Indian Ocean. We are able today, and we can continue to be able, to protect our national interest in that area with occasional visits from the 7th Fleet stationed in the Pacific Ocean.

We have naval superiority in the Indian Ocean today and there is no indication that we are going to lose it.

The gentleman from Florida in his excellent statement cited the number of ship days in the Indian Ocean, but it makes all the difference in the world what kind of ships we are talking about and the fact is that today naval superiority rests with the United States in the Indian Ocean area.

There is another reason we ought to defer on this money, too. We should be testing Soviet intentions rather than testing Soviet capabilities to react to what we might do in Diego Garcia. The most important testing of Soviet intentions will come when the Suez Canal is open. I think we all agree that opening up that canal will add flexibility to the Soviet Fleet, but it does not necessarily follow that the Soviet Union can or will automatically as a result of that, increase significantly its Indian Ocean presence.

It is the opinion of Mr. Colby from CIA, that—

If there is no substantial increase in U.S. naval forces in the area, we believe the Soviet increase will be gradual, say one to two surface combatants per year. Should the United States make a substantial increase in its naval presence in the Indian Ocean, a Soviet buildup faster and larger than I have just described would be likely.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HAMILTON was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. HAMILTON. To continue the quotation from Mr. Colby:

If the canal were open and available to Russian ships, the task of responding would be easier.

In any event, the Soviets would probably not be able to sustain an Indian Ocean force significantly larger than that presently deployed there without reordering their priorities and shifting naval forces from other areas.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, as the gentlewoman from Colorado observed, we should support her amendment, simply because the new British Government, the owners of the island, has not decided whether to support or not support the American request for expansion of facilities.

I think in light of these observations and several others that have been made this morning, the prudent course would be to hold back, to defer action for some time yet to see what happens so far as the Soviets are concerned.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, since last October, the United States has been maintaining naval forces in the Indian Ocean on a more frequent and more regular basis than in the past. These forces, which have included aircraft carriers and surface combatant units, have deployed on an intermittent basis from the Pacific Fleet to augment the three ships of the U.S. Middle East Force which have operated in the Persian Gulf and Indian Ocean for a quarter of a century.

To date, these forces have had to depend on a logistical support chain which extends more than 4,000 miles to established U.S. bases in the Philippines. As a result, in the event of an emergency or crisis in the Indian Ocean area, these units could find themselves at the exposed end of a lengthy line of supply in circumstances which would require a massive commitment of tankers and other support units from the Pacific Fleet, thus seriously degrading our capabilities in the western Pacific.

The expansion of the support facilities available to our forces on the tiny island of Diego Garcia would significantly improve both the efficiency and effectiveness of the forces deployed to the Indian Ocean. Diego Garcia is a small atoll directly in the center of the Indian Ocean. It has not native population, and it is the sovereign territory of Great Britain. At the present time we already have a communications station on the island, with an airstrip and very limited port facilities.

The present bill proposes the authorization of \$32.3 million to lengthen the runway, improve the harbor by dredging a larger anchorage and lengthening the pier, construct fuel storage tanks, enlarge the quarters for personnel stationed on the island, and otherwise to equip the island with the necessary facilities to permit support of units deployed to the Indian Ocean.

The construction of additional facilities on Diego Garcia does not imply a larger U.S. military presence in the area. No operational forces will be based there. No ships will be homeported there. No U.S. dependents will live there. On the contrary, the effect of this construction will be to permit more efficient support of units which operate in that area from time to time. It will shorten the length of the supply chain and reduce the chances that such operations will place sudden and unexpected demands on our limited support resources in the Pacific.

We are all aware of the growing importance of this area to the United States and its allies. The Indian Ocean is the third largest ocean of the world, and over its surface each day passes 50 percent of all the oil transported by sea. The stability of this vast region is inextricably linked to broader issues of international security.

The Soviet Union has maintained a permanent naval force in the Indian Ocean since 1968, and that presence has been growing steadily over the years. At the present time, the U.S.S.R. has almost 30 ships in the area, including 7 combatant units. For the most part, these units operate in the north-

western corner of the Indian Ocean, where they have established regular access to port facilities in the harbor of Berbera in Somalia. There they have a communications station, fuel storage, personnel quarters for the Soviet technicians and their dependents, and floating repair facilities, in addition to a runway which is under construction. To date, the Soviet Fleet has been supported from the Soviet Pacific Fleet, but this lengthy supply line will be cut sharply when the Suez Canal opens and the distance from the Black Sea to the Indian Ocean is cut by more than 70 percent.

There is no way to predict the course of events in this area where the United States and its allies have a significant investment both in the political and the commercial sense. In the absence of certainty, it would appear both prudent and reasonable to insure that we can make our own presence known from time to time. Such capability would be facilitated and rendered more economical by the development of support installations on Diego Garcia, as authorized in this legislation.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do somewhat regret the fact that an issue such as this—and it is certainly no one's error, it just has happened—but I do regret that an issue like this has to be discussed on this day of all days, simply because I think we all recognize when we look around this floor that so many Members of this House are occupied with other momentous moments in this country's history. I think we know what will happen to this amendment because this issue has not yet received much publicity.

Mr. Chairman, I do want to rise, nevertheless, in support of the amendment, because I think it is important to state my doubts about it. I had opposed very strongly the inclusion of this amendment in the supplemental request for last fiscal year. I was somewhat ambivalent about it in this bill, but I thought long and hard about it, and I questioned the Navy in our hearings in the Military Construction Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, and I have come to the conclusion, as the gentleman from Indiana has indicated, that prudence would dictate that for now we lay this matter aside.

I say this, not because I have any great worry about the fact that the Navy wants to use this refueling station, as it has been termed, as the foot in the door, the camel's nose under the tent, to go on to bigger and better things, but rather because I do think it could elicit an irrational overresponse from the Russians.

If one has studied Russian history, I think the one thing that becomes apparent is that because of their history, they really in a sense have almost a paranoid outlook on any action which takes place around the world which is anywhere near the Russian sphere of influence.

I think that the gentleman from Indiana is correct that while our intentions may be harmless and above board,

certain segments within the Russian power structure will not view it to be that way. I think that Diego Garcia, if it is developed, could, in fact, act as a magnet in attracting Russian efforts and presence in the Indian Ocean in the future.

Mr. Chairman, let me just make a few comments. It was indicated, I think by the chairman of my subcommittee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES), that the Russians have four times the amount of combatants and supply ships in that area, most of the time, than we have. That is true, if you look at the numbers; but as has been pointed out several times previously, the important thing is not to look at the number of ships in that area, but to look at the kind of ships in that area.

Of these questions, everybody has a tendency to toss around references to classified sheets and wave them before the House. Well, we can all do that. If anyone wants to look, I can show him here what the character of those ships was in the Indian Ocean, should he want to take a look at those sheets. I can show other sheets provided me by the Navy. I can show the Members sheets indicating what the situation is as far as access to various ports within the Indian Ocean is concerned.

We can all do that. But the point is that the Navy will admit—under questioning, they have to me and they have to others—that any time we want, we can have greater fire power there—indeed, we have had greater fire power in the Indian Ocean—than have the Russians.

The statement was also made by someone—I have forgotten which speaker it was—that the reason some of the countries in the immediate area have protested to our Government about our plans in Diego Garcia is because they merely have to do that to mollify the leftists within their own country.

If that is true, then I would suggest that it could indeed be a great mistake to follow through with Diego Garcia, because if one follows that same logic, he will recognize then that that would put great pressure on the Indian Government.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. OBEY was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, to continue what I was saying, that would put great pressure on the Indian Government to agree to Russian pressure for base rights.

We would have that same chain occurring if we followed that logic, and I do indeed believe that in this case the Indians could feel under greater pressure to give in, not only to the leftist political groups in their own area, but also to a Russian request as well, provided that we have a visible new presence different in character than we had before which can be pointed to by those within the Soviet Union and in who are only too anxious to point to things of that nature.

It was also said by one speaker, if I heard him right, and I may not have, but if I heard him right, it was indicated by one speaker that this would really be our only base from which to strike at China and the Soviet Union. I do not think the Navy looks at this in those terms. If it does, we would most certainly be contributing to an escalation of military efforts on both sides in that area.

Mr. Chairman, if that is indeed what the gentleman from Texas said, let me also point out that the Navy itself admits that there is nothing which would be more vulnerable to attract during time of war than would be Diego Garcia.

This is not any base which we can use in time of all out war; it is only good for us in time of relative peace. If we have war, it can be wiped out in 10 minutes. I do not think anybody seriously doubts that.

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest in the interest of prudence, in the interest of giving our new President time to consider all the political ramifications of this problem, that we lay it aside for a year and see whether or not there can be achieved negotiations which will result in agreement that the Indian Ocean ought to be a hands-off area for both the Russians and ourselves.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendments.

Mr. Chairman, it is easy enough to exaggerate the significance of the facility which is to be expanded at Diego Garcia. It was said just now that should we proceed with prudence—and I hope we do—as we may elicit an irrational response from the Soviet Union.

I think we exaggerate the irrationality of the Soviets if we think there is going to be some irrational response. I do not know what an "irrational response" would constitute. I doubt very much if it sends any tremors up and down the spines of the Soviet military establishment because we decide to improve a facility in the middle of the Indian Ocean.

Mr. Chairman, I hope we are going to reject the argument that somehow prudence dictates that we do not move. In my opinion, prudence dictates that we do move.

Obviously this is going to constitute a decided improvement in the availability of facilities needed by our naval units.

I see, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, no far-reaching foreign policy consequences that would be adverse to our own interests.

I happened to be in New Delhi in February when this issue was very much a matter of headlines in the Indian newspapers, and I heard no complaints from any Indian officials. I did have time to have some discussions with university students, who expressed concern about the development and the possible aggressive intentions of the United States because of our desire to improve Diego Garcia.

I said I would doubt very much that a base over a thousand miles from the territorial lands of India could possibly

be considered a threat under any circumstances. I think it is ridiculous to suggest that the Indians are now going to feel compelled to succumb to the demands of the Soviet Union for a base on Indian territory because we improve this facility.

So I hope we do not buy the argument that something is to be gained by postponing a decision. I think it is a reasonable suggestion that we go ahead and improve this facility, and I, myself, see no adverse foreign policy consequences in connection with this.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, what puzzles me is why we are doing this in the first place.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Well, as I said to the gentleman earlier, we held hearings in our subcommittee, and we did have considerable discussion then as to why we were doing it. The testimony is available.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I am sure the gentleman acknowledges that the testimony suggests there is no need for this.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, that certainly is not true. I suggest that the gentleman read the testimony, both in our own subcommittee and before the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman is familiar with the testimony in the record which was given by the Central Intelligence Agency.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Of course, I might say to the gentleman I have read the testimony, and I come down firmly on the side that there is nothing to be gained by a delay or a mulling over of the wisdom of doing this. To me, all the cards are stacked in favor of this move.

I do not think it is against our national interest; I believe it is very much in our national interest.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman agree that if we increase the naval presence on the part of the United States in that area, that will increase the naval presence of the Soviets, as the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) pointed out?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I think that is a ridiculous argument. I do not agree with the gentleman that this is necessarily going to increase our naval presence. It certainly is going to make our operations in the Indian Ocean more economical, because we will be able to do a lot more with a little improvement of our facilities.

As the gentleman from Wisconsin has already pointed out, there is already a far greater naval presence on the part of the Soviets in that area than there is on the part of the United States. I think it is ridiculous for us to try to develop some kind of a fear that we are going to develop a rivalry on the part of the Soviet Union because of this very modest improvement made by the United States. It is an absurd argument that the national interests of the Soviet Union

are involved, and that they will develop a naval race or a possible military confrontation in the Indian Ocean, certainly we are not advocating that.

Mr. FRASER. If the gentleman will yield further, what interests of the United States are at stake in the middle of the Indian Ocean?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. In my opinion it is important that we maintain a presence there. A question like that from a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs who presumably is informed on this surprises me. I would assume that what has been going on in the Middle East would surely be enough to indicate that we have a legitimate reason for a presence in that area.

No one is suggesting, that I know of, that we should move out entirely for fear of adverse consequences if we do not. I would think the gentleman from Minnesota would understand that we have a very major interest in the stability in the Middle East.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRASER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, unless the gentleman pushes that kind of argument, why should anyone think that this is what we are engaged in? What the gentleman seems to be saying is that we should not improve a facility that the gentleman recognizes is necessary. To me there is no logic in that, and unless the gentleman wants to make a mountain out of a mole hill, I do not find our potential adversaries, or those around the Indian Ocean, really pushing very hard if there is some imminent threat or a change in the character of their interest in the area by what we are proposing.

Mr. FRASER. The gentleman agrees that the agents have asked the Indian Ocean be demilitarized? Does he agree with that fact?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I think we all would like to see demilitarization.

Mr. FRASER. Does the gentleman agree that they have asked for that status?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I think it is a goal to be desired, and I think we would like to see less emphasis on armaments; but this is not an argument for us to say we should not improve the facility.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know that I can make an effective contribution to the factual side of this debate that has not been made very eloquently already by the speaker who preceded me, but let me offer some observations, if I can, on the state of mind attendant to the Diego Garcia proposal.

This debate has all the trappings of a hearing of Committee on Armed Services hearing. We are replete with maps outside of the door showing the "threat" in the now new-defined fashion. We have

so many references to secrecy, and certain Members being privy to knowledge which no one else has, that I am surprised we do not conclude this debate by stamping the whole thing "secret" and asking, once again, the American Congress to act as an article of faith and to take the word of those who claim to know much more about the threat than we do.

I served briefly, and I am sure controversially as far as substantive contribution made, on the committee from which this proposal emanates. To say that there is a balanced approach in the committee is, I think, to do a disservice to reality, when it comes to an objective effort at hearing the other side of this argument.

I am reminded, as recently as last night and as poignantly as this morning in the valedictory of the last holder of the Office of the Presidency, before Mr. Gerald R. Ford took office at noontime, that one of the hopes the previous occupant had for his administration, and that he remembered historically, was the contribution he made toward changing foreign policy perceptions which had been believed and adhered to for 25 years. Those perceptions are the sort of things that I think are at stake in this kind of debate.

We can argue the reasons for and against Diego Garcia. We can question whether or not our knowledge is roughly equal to the knowledge offered by those who have thought they had expertise because of service on the committee, or access to secret information. But when do we begin to take the step, to take the challenge to give something more than just promises, and give some substance to the questions of what we do, and when do we demonstrate we are not going to continue down that path which we so often find ourselves following?

I sat through most of the debate on the Defense appropriations bill the other day. Ironically, it took only a day to get rid of \$83 billion of our wealth over the course of the next fiscal year, and, the same kind of circular reasoning—the closed circuitry which characterizes the kind of committee activity on these things—again reemerges on this Friday afternoon.

Last Friday it was Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe. This Friday it is Diego Garcia and the military construction bill.

There has been testimony on Diego Garcia, which has been clearly contradictory. The Navy's spokesman, Admiral Zumwalt, who has found popular support on the Republican side of the aisle and with certain segments on my side of the aisle, would like to have us believe that there is a Soviet threat that would justify a Diego Garcia base, while in separate testimony CIA Director Colby has cast severe doubt on the Navy estimate. Despite these contradictions, we cannot bring ourselves to stand here and say we will renounce right now, in the face of least conflicting testimony, the dangerous course of unilateral expansion in the Indian Ocean. The question now is whether or not we trigger another arms

race by giving the Navy all they want to spend over the next calendar year at Diego Garcia, and by giving the Navy one more ethic to justify its budget.

It seems to me, without attempting to repeat the kind of factual groundwork which has been gone over and over, that the time has come for this country to take a chance, in the direction of showing we can give something more than false expectations to that gallery as to what we are going to do with the resources of this country, and foresake the Diego Garcia Naval Base.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I will not hold up the Committee unduly but I do think it is time we got a little factual information on this situation. Although many of the Members have had the opportunity to see the charts that were in the corridor, I think it might be helpful to bring them in and remind the Members once again what we are really talking about and what the situation is that actually confronts us.

If these charts look familiar, Mr. Chairman, it is because we have been down this route once before. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) said he thought it was last year. It was not last year. It was last April. We had the whole question of Diego Garcia before us in April in the supplemental appropriation bill, and on the fourth of April, after these charts had been presented and after the issue had been debated in detail and after we had a chance to make up our minds, this House voted 255 to 94 to go ahead with the construction at Diego Garcia.

So we are not operating in a vacuum. This is something that we have considered carefully and we have voted on before.

So why is it back here again in this Chamber? It is because the distinguished body at the other end of the Capitol decided they would rather handle the matter in the military construction bill, and so very, very reluctantly the conferees on the part of the House had to give in. We have now come back with the same proposal in the construction bill for the consideration of Members of the House.

A great deal has been made about the testimony of the head of the CIA. What the head of the CIA actually said was that regardless of what we do, if we do not even put a sailboat in a bathtub in the Indian Ocean, the Russians are going to continue to increase their naval presence in the Indian Ocean steadily as they have been for the past 5 or 6 years. He also said that if we increase our naval presence they will probably increase their naval presence accordingly.

OK. Now what we have presented in this bill is not an increase in naval "presence" at all. As a matter of fact we do not even have any naval presence in the Indian Ocean. We have to go into the Indian Ocean temporarily from Thailand or from the Philippines or from the Persian Gulf or around the Cape of Good Hope. We do not have a single base in the Indian Ocean. We have only a communications station.

Those hammers and sickles that the Members see over there on that chart are real live Soviet naval bases.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. STRATTON. I will be glad to yield after I have completed my remarks, but now let us get the facts.

The one at the top for example is in Iraq. They have POL facilities there and they have got limited shore facilities. The one in Yemen has extensive British facilities which the Russians are now using. They also have dry docks and they have got storage and POL, which means petroleum, oil, and lubricants. Down in Berbera the Russians have a barracks and they have a repair ship and they have further POL storage. In Mogadiscio in the Somalia Republic the Soviets have been building, and I think by now have almost completed, a whole new military airfield. In addition to that they have the two anchorages at Socotra and one down in the Seychelles; and the Socotra anchorage also contains POL facilities, the kind of oil storage we seek for Diego Garcia.

But we have no "presence" in the Indian Ocean. All we want to do, all we are proposing in this bill, is to allow a fueling station for those U.S. ships that may occasionally, from time to time, come in. This is not going to increase the number of ships at all.

We think that it makes some sense that we should have at least one gas pump, if you like, in the middle of the Indian Ocean, a couple storage tanks with aviation gas and naval fuel, and that we ought to have a little pier, that we ought to have some dredging done, and that we ought to extend the runway by 4,000 feet. All those actions are not going to bring a single additional ship into the Indian Ocean.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent Mr. STRATTON was allowed to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.)

Mr. STRATTON. As I say, this construction is not going to bring a single additional ship into the Indian Ocean. It simply is going to mean that the ships that we have there from time to time will have an opportunity to pick up a little fuel.

Somebody asked a moment ago, what kind of interest does the United States have in the Indian Ocean?

Well, I would think if we had a Navy it would certainly be in our interest to have fuel facilities available for that Navy in various places. Yet we do not have now a single fuel facility in the entire Indian Ocean for the Navy, in comparison to all that the Soviets have. That is all that is involved here. And all it includes is an expenditure of \$29 million.

Now, the last time we went through this debate, we heard all this business about escalating the arms race and the naval competition in the Indian Ocean which was now an area of peace.

Well, there are three things that have changed since we last debated this question in April. Point one is Portugal. We pointed out at that time that if we

wanted to supply the Middle East in a new emergency, and somehow Portugal denied us the Azores, the only other way to get supplies to the Middle East would be by staging our C-5's at Diego Garcia. We suggested then that perhaps there might be a revolution in Portugal. And now they have had one.

Second, the Indians complained last spring that we were upsetting this beautiful, peaceful area where everybody was at peace. But what did they do shortly thereafter? They exploded an atom bomb since we last voted on Diego Garcia. So the Indians cannot be too much concerned about threats to the peace.

The third thing that happened, the Air Force at Utapao in Thailand has recently been denied permission for any flights into the Indian Ocean for resupply or anything of that kind; so there is even more reason why we should build these facilities to supply fuel for the very limited presence that we have there now. What is the point of having a Navy and saying that we believe we ought to have access to all the world's sea lanes, and then say, however, we are not going to supply any fuel to our ships?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Thank you for yielding. The gentleman has always been fair on this point. It seems to me what the gentleman and others are talking about, this thing of putting a \$29 million filling station is at odds with the report. Now, who is kidding whom?

The last report I read this year said the chief advantage of Diego Garcia lies in the ability to show the flag, to make a major show of force.

The report this time says we may lose political and diplomatic influence by default. That is at odds with what the gentleman says.

Mr. STRATTON. It is not at odds at all. During the Middle East war, for example, the carrier *Enterprise* sailed into the Indian Ocean. I suppose that is what we mean by "showing the flag." But the *Enterprise* is a nuclear ship. If we do not have a nuclear ship available then we must get oil for it from somewhere. It cannot operate very long or over long distances without fuel.

The only reason we want ships in the Indian Ocean are the same reason we send ships everywhere; in other words, to protect the sea lanes and provide security.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. RYAN. Let me see if I have this right. The gentleman is saying, if I can summarize his argument in favor of Diego Garcia, we have been in effect then a communications facility in the past, or a kind of phone booth, and now we are going to be a petroleum depot or a kind of filling station. There are those who say it is going to be a police station or a much larger permanent base to be used for American national defense interests.

I presume from all the gentleman says,

he would deny this is to be used for any further purpose than simply for petroleum and fueling purposes.

Mr. STRATTON. It would be used to supply those ships of our Navy which from time to time we would like to have operate in the Indian Ocean. By having the fuel there, it means that they can operate longer and faster in the Indian Ocean.

Mr. RYAN. It would be primarily for fueling purposes, is that right?

Mr. STRATTON. That is right.

Mr. RYAN. Let me ask the gentleman this: Would he then oppose, since the argument seems to be not so much fueling as what it may become—would the gentleman oppose a Pentagon request for that island to become more than a fueling station?

Mr. STRATTON. At this point, I do not see any need for any such request. I think what we ought ultimately to do should be based on what happens when the Suez Canal is opened. If we see, as some people tell us we will, that a great hegira of Soviet ships will come down from the Black Sea into the Indian Ocean, then that could conceivably create a new problem and we would have to reevaluate that new situation.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendments.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, the United States has maintained a military presence in the Indian Ocean area for more than 20 years, consisting primarily of the three ships of Middle East force operating out of Bahrain Island in the Persian Gulf. During the past 8 months, the United States has been conducting more frequent naval deployments into the Indian Ocean, including the periodic deployment of a carrier task force. Such deployments provide tangible evidence of concern for security and stability in a region where significant U.S. interests are located.

At the same time, we should not ignore the economic costs associated with such deployments. The nearest U.S.-support facility to the operating areas of our forces in the Indian Ocean is in the Philippines, some 4,000 miles away. Consequently, the Department of Defense has requested the Congress to authorize the expansion of the present communications facility on the island of Diego Garcia into a limited support facility. The requested \$32.3 million appropriation would permit lengthening of the runway from 8,000 to 12,000 feet, expansion of the anchorage area in the lagoon, extension of the small pier to permit alongside berthing, and construction of POL storage facilities and additional personnel quarters.

The island of Diego Garcia is an uninhabited coral atoll in the center of the Indian Ocean. It is under British sovereignty as part of the British Indian Ocean Territory—BIOT—which was constituted in 1965. Since 1966 the islands of the BIOT have been available for the joint defense use of Britain and the United States under the terms of a government-to-government agreement, and there has been a joint United States-

United Kingdom communications station on the island since 1973. The expansion of facilities on the island would facilitate the effective support of periodic deployments into the Indian Ocean area and would avoid many of the difficulties associated with a 4,000-mile logistical "tail."

Neither the deployments nor the proposed support facilities at Diego Garcia represent a uniquely American concern. Last fall, the French created a new Indian Ocean command which currently consists of nine combatant units; the British also regularly maintain up to five combatant naval units with maritime air support from several sites in the Indian Ocean; the Soviet Union, of course, has maintained a permanent naval presence in the Indian Ocean since 1968 which at times has exceeded 30 ships, and in recent years has developed its own communications and port facilities at Berbera in Somalia. Several of the littoral states also have sizable navies, two of which—India and Iran—are considerably larger in size than the forces deployed to the area by any of the external powers.

The Indian Ocean is no more a naval vacuum than it is a political or economic vacuum, and the periodic presence of the U.S. naval ships in the third largest ocean of the world can be considered neither a remarkable event nor a threat to any nation in the area. On the contrary, a periodic U.S. presence in the Indian Ocean provides tangible evidence of our concern for security and stability in a region where significant U.S. interests are located. Our capability to maintain such a presence would be significantly enhanced by the development of a limited support facility on the island of Diego Garcia.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mrs. SCHROEDER).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mrs. SCHROEDER) there were—ayes 28; noes 58.

So the amendments were rejected.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 11, line 16, strike out the figure "\$20,648,000" and substitute the figure "\$20,948,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 11, line 20, strike out the word "Feld" and substitute the word "Field."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 19, line 9, strike out the figure "\$4,151,000" and substitute the figure "\$4,157,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ST GERMAIN

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ST GERMAIN: Title II is amended by striking out on line 16 of page 9 "\$2,582,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$4,153,000".

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, yesterday, August 8, I sent a "Dear Colleague" letter around to all of the Members of the House. It set forth the justification for the amendment offered.

On April 17, 1973, the Department of Defense announced a major realignment which involved the consolidation, reduction or closing of 274 military installations in the United States. Fifty percent of the impact fell on the State of Rhode Island with the closing of Quonset Point Naval Air Station and the transfer of the Newport Fleet, consisting of 39 destroyers and cruisers, to southern ports.

Revitalization of the economy of the Newport area from the outset has depended upon a full utilization of the vacated destroyer piers. Extensive negotiations have proceeded for over a year between the State of Rhode Island, GSA and the Navy with the assistance of the Department of Defense Office of Economic Adjustment.

The Navy has now solicited leasing bids for utilization of the piers and adjacent warehousing facilities.

The facilities involved were excessed last fall with the approval of the Committee on Armed Services.

Essential to this entire project is the relocation base public works administration building, which was struck from the Navy's request by the committee and placed in a deferred category.

Under the bill before us today, my review of the hearings reveals totally incomplete responses to questions, and legitimate questions, raised by the members of the Committee on Armed Services, by Navy and Department of Defense witnesses. The Sims Hall alterations were described as a project for the sole use and benefit of the Naval War College.

The facts are that the center serves the fleet worldwide and accommodates numerous other requests for war game programming essential for strategic long-range planning. Today, a number of potential subcontractors are even at this very moment inspecting the facility for bidding on software components, and equipment installation contracts are currently being negotiated or planned.

Last spring, many Members on both sides of the aisle expressed their sympathy for Rhode Island's being required to shoulder the burden of the DOD realignment plan. With the loss of a military population in excess of 15,000 officers and men in the Newport area alone in little over a year, the Members can well imagine the effect upon our economy. We have turned to the task of pulling ourselves up by our bootstraps. All I ask is that you support my amendment to restore a total of \$1,571,000 for the 2 items I have described, both requested by the Navy. The decision to close or substantially reduce our naval bases was

a cruel and callous one. Our efforts to obtain a review and reconsideration were met by failure. The total costs of the move are yet to be determined. But that is all water under the bridge.

I urge that the Members support, in the name of simple fairness and equity, my amendment to restore vitally needed facilities. I deeply regret that my colleagues on the Committee on Armed Services were not furnished accurate and complete responses to their questions.

I am hopeful, frankly, that the committee will accept this amendment.

I might say this to my colleagues: Newport does not just have scars from what happened to us with the closing down of the bases. We still have gaping, wide-open wounds. We have not recovered. The economy is in a very bad condition.

I would like to make another point, and that is that as far as the Navy requests are concerned, the cuts totalled \$21,801,000. Here again, the cut for Newport, Rhode Island, is practically 10 percent of the overall cut.

I have no quarrel, as I say, with the subcommittee members because they did not get accurate answers to the questions. The Navy witnesses were delinquent or did not possess the information they should have had.

No. 1, Sims Hall, as I say, will serve the entire fleet. No. 2, the warehouse is an antiquated warehouse.

One of the Members asked a question about whether there could not be a corridor built so that they could keep using the warehouse which is located in the area that had been excessed by the Navy, by the piers, and still utilize it for the War College and the schools that now remain in Newport.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. ST GERMAIN was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. ST GERMAIN. The cost of the corridor would far exceed the \$600,000 requested, and there would be a continuing cost for security measures around this warehouse, plus the fact that the Navy is present right there at the piers that are going to be leased to private industry and private contractors.

I might say that over the years I have supported military construction authorizations and appropriations, year after year after year, for 14 years.

We were hurt by the base closings, and all I am asking here today is the restoration of what was requested by the Department of Defense as necessary to them, because it will mean jobs for Rhode Islanders and especially to those in the Newport area who are out of jobs.

It will mean some small additional income to the area, and it will help strengthen the War College and the school facilities existing in the area.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the subcommittee and the committee will see fit to go along with this amendment.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to

the amendment reluctantly, because I certainly do recognize that the State of Rhode Island did, in fact, assume a very major part of the realignments in the Defense Establishment when those were announced some time ago.

I do wish to correct one thing that the gentleman from Rhode Island just stated. I was absolutely shocked last year to find that when the final passage of this same bill came along, the gentleman was not one of those who were supporting it but was one of the 25 Members who opposed it. I just happen to have the RECORD here, if the gentleman would care to check me on it.

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to state that as to the amount of cuts which were going on in this bill in relation to the State of Rhode Island, it is true that the net cuts in the bill were only \$21 million but the gross cuts in this bill were \$86.5 million.

So I do not think that the gentleman from Rhode Island or the State of Rhode Island is bearing an unfair proportion of those cuts.

We had some add-ons that we had to make. The Members just heard the add-on of \$29 million for Diego Garcia which was transferred from the military construction bill. I voted against that add-on. But the net was there. We had add-ons for deficiency authorizations of \$21.5 million.

The gentleman asks that two separate items be added to the bill. The larger item of \$971,000 was the 27th item of the bottom percentage in the priorities of the Navy as they were presented to the committee. That was for the alteration to Sims Hall.

As to the public works administration building, the committee rejected that because the Navy had assured us—and they assured us not when the base was closed but when they went to dispose of the excess property—that the disposal would not require any new construction anywhere else. This is new construction somewhere else, in contradiction to what the Navy told us would happen.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIKE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask the gentleman this: Am I right in assuming that the committee made some more cuts in Rhode Island in this bill?

Mr. PIKE. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. In addition to the meat ax cuts which were exercised a few years ago?

Mr. PIKE. We put \$2.5 million in for Rhode Island in this bill, and there is \$1.6 million taken out in this bill.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. What did the committee do to Massachusetts this year?

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I cannot answer overall; the only thing that jumps to my mind is an addition to the bill in the Reserve program for Massachusetts. I cannot give the gentleman the overall figure for the whole State because, honestly, when I look at these bills when

we are marking them up, I look at them by bases.

If the gentleman wants to ask me what we have done for the First Congressional District in the State of New York, I would be able to tell him. The answer is that there is not a dime in the bill for that district, which is my own congressional district.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I just want to make sure that we do not exercise any more cuts in facilities for the State of Massachusetts. If more cuts were made, it would be a tragedy after the meat-ax cuts that were exercised a little over a year ago.

Mr. PIKE. Let us not confuse the action of the Department of Defense in closing the bases with the actions—

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. The Committee on Armed Services would not give us any hearing. We had to go over to the other branch and get hearings.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield any more at this point.

It may have escaped the attention of the gentleman from Massachusetts but, honestly, I am not the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, and I do not always vote the strict party line, as far as the Committee on Armed Services is concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(On request of Mr. ST GERMAIN, and by unanimous consent, Mr. PIKE was allowed to proceed for 30 additional seconds.)

Mr. ST GERMAIN. If the gentleman would yield, I would say to the gentleman from New York that I appreciate the gentleman's staff correcting me about my vote last year. And my memory was vague on that one, because last year I must admit that my glands were pumping very, very heavily, and my emotions were very, very high. Frankly, in that respect, that is not the way to act. I assure the gentleman that, no matter what the results are on this amendment, I shall vote for the bill.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the gentleman from Rhode Island that I have a great deal of sympathy for the gentleman's position.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Chairman, I think that my colleague has clearly indicated that this was a request by the Navy Department; it is not an add-on, as the previous amendment was. I would like to point out to the chairman of the subcommittee and the chairman of the full committee that I supported the add-on just passed. My colleague and I voted in support of that add-on when it was in the military authorization bill.

So it is not just a question of consistently voting for or voting against, because, as the chairman of the subcommittee just admitted, he himself voted against that add-on that was supported by most of the Members of the House today, and was supported on April 4 in the general Defense Department authorization.

What we are asking the Members to support today is the amendment offered by my colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. St GERMAIN), that the Navy's request be honored by this committee. As the gentleman has pointed out, we feel that the testimony presented to the subcommittee members by the Department of Defense was not adequate because in their testimony they stated that the \$971,000 facility was for the use of the Navy War College alone, when in fact it is used for the support of the entire fleet in war games, and also in the training all of the line officers for service throughout the world in support of the naval operations.

So I urge my colleagues to support the amendment. It is a small amount; it is \$1.6 million. I think this is a cut that is not necessary. I hope that the Members will support this amendment today.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. St GERMAIN).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. St GERMAIN) there were—ayes 15, noes 26.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CARNEY of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as a sign of protest, I am going to regretfully vote against this bill. I realize that we need a strong military defense. I realize that there is much good in this bill, but I think we have to start rearranging our priorities.

I come from a district which is a steel mill district, the heart of America, the Ruhr of America. It will take about \$150 million in my district to take care of water pollution, probably another \$100 million to take care of air pollution. The plants in my district are older plants, they are marginal, standby plants, and the EPA is on our necks, quoting the rules and regulations and laws that this Congress passed which require the steel industry to install up-to-date air pollution facilities and up-to-date water pollution facilities.

The steel company officials in my district are saying we just cannot afford it and make a profit. There is no money coming from Government. The chances are that thousands of Americans in my district will be forced out of work.

One thing we have in here is \$1,059,000 for pollution abatement outside of the United States. There is \$400 million for water pollution abatement, one probably in a populated area, which may be necessary. But it just does not make sense to me, to spend this money somewhere else when I think of our own taxpayers, our own people.

I heard the very fine argument about the island of Diego Garcia, the little spot out in the middle of the Indian Ocean. I do not want to argue with the great naval genius, the gentleman, the captain of the Navy. However, some experts tell us that in case of a war, that little spot will not last 10 minutes. It is out in the middle of nowhere.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARNEY of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

If the gentleman wants to reorder his priorities, this is probably the right bill to reorder them on. He mentioned the figure of \$1 billion outside of the United States for disposal services. Actually it is only \$4 million. I should not really say only \$4 million. That is a substantial figure, but it is a lot different than \$1 billion-plus, and I think the gentleman should be corrected on his figures.

Mr. CARNEY of Ohio. No. On pollution abatement the committee approved \$1,059,000 for one air pollution abatement facility located outside of the United States—just one. \$1 million for one.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. It was not \$1 billion.

Mr. CARNEY of Ohio. And \$4 million for the water pollution.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. The gentleman has his billions and millions mixed up.

Mr. CARNEY of Ohio. We have talked about billions of dollars around here so much, it is easy to do. I do know one thing: Whenever there is something on this floor for the American people, if we want to feed school kids lunches, if we want to provide safety for American workers, if we want to give housing to people, that side is lined up. I do not see my friend, the gentleman from Iowa, here, the great man on economy. What is the matter? I do not see the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUSSELOT) who does not think we should spend 10 cents on an American. But now when these things come up, billions of dollars for war, we are not patriotic unless we vote for them. We are unpatriotic if we want to raise a question about it.

There he is, Mr. ROUSSELOT. Why does he not get up here and let us talk about some of these billions of dollars being thrown away instead of 50 cents for some American? That is what I am talking about.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote against this bill, realizing that my vote will be a protest vote.

I want the people of my district to know this, and also I want my steelworkers when they start losing their jobs to know this. We cannot afford the water pollution facilities in these United States, but in this bill alone there are more than \$5 million for water pollution and air pollution facilities outside the United States. We had better change our priorities.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

First of all I do want to get some statistics in here as to what we are spending for pollution control and where. We are spending for pollution control, total outside the United States of America, \$4 million, and it is not billion, we are spending \$4,038,000 for the Navy and \$595,000 for the Air Force for a total of \$4,633,000—and that is not billion. On the item of \$1,059,000,000 that the gentleman referred to, it is an item of

\$1,059,000 and it is in Guam. It is outside of the continental United States but it is in Guam.

Before the gentleman votes against the bill based on what we are doing for pollution control and air control, I would like to call his attention to the fact that we are spending \$7,717,000 in Ohio for air pollution control and \$537,000 in Ohio for water pollution control. I think that the pollution control items in this bill are not only justified but they are also rather properly distributed among the States of the United States of America and its possessions.

Mr. JOHN L. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I would like to, if I may, ask on my time a couple of questions of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee. On page 10, under "Naval District, Washington" on line 7 we have for the National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Md., \$14,943,000. On lines 9 and 10 we have \$15,000,000 for the university. Are they same item or two different items?

Mr. PIKE. No; they are two different items. They are not the same.

Mr. JOHN L. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, can the gentleman tell me what is the relationship between the two?

Mr. PIKE. Yes. The first item is for improvement and modernization of the existing Naval Hospital at Bethesda and the second is for preliminary planning and beginning of the new school for the training of medical officers for the services.

Mr. JOHN L. BURTON. Then the \$15 million would be only preliminary because this is to train more military doctors, I believe.

Mr. PIKE. It is only the beginning of the project and what the total amount of the project will be, I do not think I can tell the gentleman at this time.

Mr. JOHN L. BURTON. That was my concern, because I did not feel that \$15 million would be enough for such a worthy project.

Mr. PIKE. \$15 million, I guarantee, will not be enough to build a new medical university.

Mr. JOHN L. BURTON. So this would really just be the beginning for us?

Mr. PIKE. That is correct.

Mr. JOHN L. BURTON. I thank the gentleman very much.

The CHAIRMAN. The clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III

Sec. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following acquisition and construction:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

AEROSPACE DEFENSE COMMAND

Peterson Field, Colorado Springs, Colorado, \$5,426,000.

Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Florida, \$2,775,000.

AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS SERVICE

Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Grandview, Missouri, \$805,000.

AIR FORCE LOGISTICS COMMAND

Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah, \$11,894,000.
 Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas, \$4,079,000.
 McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, California, \$7,017,000.
 Newark Air Force Station, Newark, Ohio, \$1,977,000.
 Robins Air Force Base, Warner Robins, Georgia, \$792,000.
 Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, \$9,839,000.
 Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio, \$10,371,000.

AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND

Arnold Engineering Development Center, Tullahoma, Tennessee, \$48,240,000.
 Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California, \$1,198,000.
 Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida, \$10,475,000.
 Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, New Mexico, \$232,000.
 Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Florida, \$642,000.
 Satellite Tracking Facilities, \$832,000.

AIR TRAINING COMMAND

Chanute Air Force Base, Rantoul, Illinois, \$6,267,000.
 Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Mississippi, \$169,000.
 Keesler Air Force Base, Biloxi, Mississippi, \$7,297,000.
 Laughlin Air Force Base, Del Rio, Texas, \$298,000.
 Lowry Air Force Base, Denver, Colorado, \$7,885,000.
 Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, California, \$2,143,000.
 Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas, \$790,000.
 Reese Air Force Base, Lubbock, Texas, \$836,000.
 Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Texas, \$8,631,000.
 Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma, \$1,998,000.
 Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring, Texas, \$776,000.
 Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Arizona, \$536,000.

AIR UNIVERSITY

Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama, \$3,753,000.

ALASKAN AIR COMMAND

Elmendorf Air Force Base, Fairbanks, Alaska, \$310,000.
 Various Locations, \$14,962,000.

HEADQUARTERS COMMAND

Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland, \$5,929,000.
 Bolling Air Force Base, Washington, District of Columbia, \$3,155,000.

MILITARY AIRLIFT COMMAND

Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Delaware, \$1,373,000.
 McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, New Jersey, \$408,000.
 Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Illinois, \$5,451,000.
 Travis Air Force Base, Fairchild, California, \$8,800,000.

PACIFIC AIR FORCES

Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii, \$10,959,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, Louisiana, \$641,000.
 Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Arkansas, \$675,000.
 Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Arizona, \$3,009,000.

Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, South Dakota, \$10,105,000.

Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, New York, \$1,774,000.
 Grissom Air Force Base, Peru, Indiana, \$323,000.

K. I. Sawyer Air Force Base, Marquette, Michigan, \$7,050,000.

Kincheloe Air Force Base, Kinross, Michigan, \$835,000.

Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana, \$3,740,000.

McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita, Kansas, \$3,038,000.

Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota, \$238,000.

Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska, \$5,595,000.

Pease Air Force Base, Portsmouth, New Hampshire, \$115,000.

Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh, New York, \$882,000.

Whiteman Air Force Base, Knob Noster, Missouri, \$6,692,000.

TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

Cannon Air Force Base, Clovis, New Mexico, \$883,000.

George Air Force Base, Victorville, California, \$3,846,000.

Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, New Mexico, \$1,565,000.

Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Virginia, \$3,056,000.

Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Arkansas, \$5,141,000.

Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, Myrtle Beach, South Carolina, \$300,000.

Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nevada, \$6,495,000.

Pope Air Force Base, Fayetteville, North Carolina, \$730,000.

Seymour Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro, North Carolina, \$3,948,000.

Various Locations, \$5,194,000.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

Various Locations, Air Pollution Abatement, \$9,156,000.
 Various Locations, Water Pollution Abatement, \$13,700,000.

SPECIAL FACILITIES

Various Locations, \$9,152,000.

AEROSPACE CORPORATION

Los Angeles, California, \$9,000,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

AEROSPACE DEFENSE COMMAND

Various Locations, \$138,000.

PACIFIC AIR FORCES

Various Locations, \$4,812,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCES IN EUROPE

Germany, \$280,000.

United Kingdom, \$884,000.

Various Locations, \$63,081,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE SECURITY SERVICE

Various Locations, \$4,135,000.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

Various Locations, Water Pollution Abatement, \$595,000.

SPECIAL FACILITIES

Various Locations, \$1,999,000.

SEC. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment, in the total amount of \$8,100,000.

SEC. 303. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop Air Force installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Air

Force missions and responsibilities which have been occasioned by: (1) unforeseen security considerations, (2) new weapons developments, (3) new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or (4) improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next Military Construction Authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of \$10,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Air Force, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire upon enactment of the fiscal year 1976 Military Construction Authorization Act, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

SEC. 304. Notwithstanding any other law or regulation to the contrary, the sum of \$8,000 is authorized for the purchase and installation of material at the transmission facility of KNTV in San Jose, California, to shield such facility from interferences with its broadcast signal caused by operation of the radar facility at Almaden Air Force station in California.

SEC. 305. (a) Section 301 of Public Law 93-166 is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "AEROSPACE DEFENSE COMMAND" with respect to Peterson Field, Colorado Springs, Colorado, strike out "\$7,843,000" and insert in place thereof "\$9,733,000."

(2) Under the subheading "AIR FORCE LOGISTICS COMMAND" with respect to Robins Air Force Base, Warner Robins, Georgia, strike out "\$4,628,000" and insert in place thereof "\$7,324,000."

(3) Under the subheading "AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND" with respect to Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida, strike out "\$7,039,000" and insert in place thereof "\$8,882,000."

(4) Under the subheading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND" with respect to Keesler Air Force Base, Biloxi, Mississippi, strike out "\$8,786,000" and insert in place thereof "\$10,733,000."

(5) Under the subheading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND" with respect to Lackland Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas, strike out "\$6,509,000" and insert in place thereof "\$9,186,000."

(6) Under the subheading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND" with respect to Reese Air Force Base, Lubbock, Texas, strike out "\$4,211,000" and insert in place thereof "\$6,461,000."

(7) Under the subheading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND" with respect to Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma, strike out "\$371,000" and insert in place thereof "\$895,000."

(8) Under the subheading "MILITARY AIRLIFT COMMAND" with respect to Altus Air Force Base, Altus, Oklahoma, strike out "\$1,078,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,440,000."

(9) Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND" with respect to Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, Cheyenne, Wyoming, strike out "\$5,834,000" and insert in place thereof "\$8,265,000."

(10) Under the subheading "TACTICAL AIR COMMAND" with respect to Little Rock Air

Force Base, Little Rock, Arkansas, strike out "\$1,165,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,200,000."

(b) Public Law 93-166 is further amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 602 "\$238,439,000" and "\$260,741,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$256,094,000" and "\$278,396,000", respectively.

Mr. PIKE (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title III be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to title III? If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE IV

Sec. 401. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment, for defense agencies for the following acquisition and construction:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

DEFENSE MAPPING AGENCY

Defense Mapping Agency Aerospace Center (Saint Louis AFS), Saint Louis, Missouri, \$2,573,000.

Fort Belvoir, Virginia, \$670,000.

DEFENSE SUPPLY AGENCY

Defense Construction Supply Center, Columbus, Ohio, \$1,862,000.

Defense Depot, Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania, \$394,000.

Defense Depot, Memphis, Tennessee, \$1,399,000.

Defense Depot, Ogden, Utah, \$527,000.

Defense Electronics Supply Center, Dayton, Ohio, \$572,000.

Defense Industrial Plant Equipment Facility, Atchinson, Kansas, \$646,000.

Defense Personnel Support Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, \$936,000.

NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY

Fort George G. Meade, Maryland, \$2,363,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

DEFENSE NUCLEAR AGENCY

Johnston Atoll, \$1,458,000.

Sec. 402. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop installations and facilities which he determines to be vital to the security of the United States, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of \$15,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including real estate actions pertaining thereto.

Mr. PIKE (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title IV be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to title IV? If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE V—MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING AND HOMEOWNERS ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Sec. 501. The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to construct, at the locations hereinafter named, family housing units and mobile home facilities in the numbers hereinafter listed, but no family housing construction shall be commenced at any such locations in the United States, until the Secretary shall have consulted with the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, as to the availability of adequate private housing at such locations. If agreement cannot be reached with respect to the availability of adequate private housing at any location, the Secretary of Defense shall immediately notify the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate, in writing, of such difference of opinion, and no contract for construction at such location shall be entered into for a period of thirty days after such notification has been given. This authority shall include the authority to acquire land, and interests in land, by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

(a) Family housing units—

(1) The Department of the Army, one thousand nine hundred units, \$58,614,639:

Fort Stewart/Hunter Army Air Field, Georgia, four hundred units.

Fort Riley, Kansas, one hundred units.

Fort Campbell, Kentucky, one thousand units.

Fort Eustis, Virginia, one hundred units.

United States Army Installations, Atlantic Side, Canal Zone, one hundred units.

United States Army Installations, Pacific Side, Canal Zone, two hundred units.

(2) The Department of the Navy, two thousand and fifty units, \$66,049,919:

Naval Complex, San Diego, California, five hundred units.

Naval Complex, Jacksonville, Florida, two hundred units.

Naval Complex, New Orleans, Louisiana, two hundred units.

Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina, three hundred units.

Naval Complex, Charleston, South Carolina, three hundred and fifty units.

Naval Complex, Bremerton, Washington, three hundred units.

Naval Complex, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, two hundred units.

(3) The Department of the Air Force, one thousand four hundred units, \$44,653,442.

United States Air Force Installations, Oahu, Hawaii, two hundred units.

Pease Air Force Base, New Hampshire, one hundred units.

Altus Air Force Base, Oklahoma, one hundred units.

Misawa Air Base, Japan, two hundred units.

Kadena Air Base, Okinawa, three hundred units.

Clark Air Base, Philippines, five hundred units.

(b) Mobile home facilities—

(1) The Department of the Army, two hundred and forty spaces, \$960,000.

(2) The Department of the Air Force, two hundred spaces, \$388,000.

Sec. 502. (a) Authorization for the construction of family housing provided in section 501 of this Act shall be subject, under such regulations as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe, to the following limitations on cost, which shall include shades, screens, ranges, refrigerators, and all other installed equipment and fixtures, the cost of the family unit, and the proportionate costs of land

acquisition, site preparation and installation of utilities.

(b) The average unit cost for all units of family housing constructed in the United States (other than Alaska and Hawaii) shall not exceed \$30,000 and in no event shall the cost of any unit exceed \$46,000.

(c) When family housing units are constructed in areas other than that specified in subsection (b) the average cost of all such units shall not exceed \$40,000, and in no event shall the cost of any unit exceed \$46,000.

Sec. 503. The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to accomplish alterations, additions, expansions or extensions not otherwise authorized by law, to existing public quarters at a cost not to exceed—

(1) for the Department of the Army, \$20,000,000.

(2) for the Department of the Navy, \$20,000,000.

(3) for the Department of the Air Force, \$20,000,000.

Sec. 504. The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to construct or otherwise acquire at the locations hereinafter named, family housing units not subject to the limitations on such cost contained in section 502 of this Act. This authority shall include the authority to acquire land, and interests in land, by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise. Total costs shall include shades, screens, ranges, refrigerators, and other installed equipment and fixtures, the cost of the family unit, and the costs of land acquisition, site preparation, and installation of utilities.

(a) Naval Station, Keflavik, Iceland, two hundred units, at a total cost not to exceed \$9,600,000.

(b) Two family housing units in Warsaw, Poland, at a total cost not to exceed \$120,000. This authority shall be funded by use of excess foreign currency when so provided in Department of Defense Appropriation Acts.

Sec. 505. The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to accomplish repairs and improvements to existing public quarters in amounts in excess of the \$15,000 limitation prescribed in section 610(a) of Public Law 90-110, as amended (81 Stat. 279, 305), as follows:

Fort McNair, Washington, District of Columbia, five units, \$175,500.

Fort Sam Houston, Texas, one hundred forty units, \$2,352,800.

Sec. 506. (a) Section 515 of Public Law 84-161 (69 Stat. 324, 352), as amended, is further amended by (1) striking out "1974 and 1975" and inserting in lieu thereof "1975 and 1976", and (2) revising the third sentence to read as follows: "Expenditures for the rental of such housing facilities, including the cost of utilities and maintenance and operation, may not exceed: For the United States (other than Alaska and Hawaii), Puerto Rico, and Guam an average of \$235 per month for each military department or the amount of \$310 per month for any one unit; and for Alaska and Hawaii, an average of \$295 per month for each military department, or the amount of \$365 per month for any one unit."

(b) Section 507(b) of Public Law 93-166 (87 Stat. 661, 676) is amended by striking out "\$325", and "seven thousand five hundred", and inserting in lieu thereof "\$355" and "twelve thousand", respectively.

Sec. 507. There is authorized to be appropriated for use by the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, for military family housing and homeowners assistance as authorized by law for the following purposes:

(1) for construction and acquisition of family housing, including improvements to public quarters, minor construction, relocation of family housing rental guarantee payments, construction and acquisition of mobile home facilities, and planning, an amount not to exceed \$245,366,000;

(2) for support of military family housing, including operating expenses, leasing, maintenance of real property, payments of principal and interest on mortgage debts incurred, payment to the Commodity Credit Corporation, and mortgage insurance premiums authorized under section 222 of the National Housing Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1715m), an amount not to exceed \$935,515,000; and

(3) for homeowners assistance under section 1013 of Public Law 89-754 (80 Stat. 1255, 1290), including acquisition of properties, an amount not to exceed \$5,000,000.

Mr. PIKE (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title V be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to title V? If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE VI

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 601. The Secretary of each military department may proceed to establish or develop installations and facilities under this Act without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529), and sections 4774 and 9774 of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U.S.C. 255), and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

Sec. 602. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but appropriations for public works projects authorized by titles I, II, III, IV, and V, shall not exceed—

(1) for title I: Inside the United States \$490,555,000; outside the United States, \$121,098,000; or a total of \$611,653,000.

(2) for title II: Inside the United States, \$490,542,000; outside the United States, \$55,331,000; or a total of \$545,873,000.

(3) for title III: Inside the United States, \$317,203,000; outside the United States, \$75,924,000; section 302, \$8,100,000; or a total of \$401,227,000.

(4) for title IV: A total of \$28,400,000.

(5) for title V: Military family housing and homeowners assistance, \$1,185,881,000.

Sec. 603. (a) Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c), any of the amounts specified in titles I, II, III, and IV of this Act, may, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned, be increased by 5 per centum when inside the United States (other than Hawaii and Alaska), and by 10 per centum when outside the United States or in Hawaii and Alaska, if he determines that such increase (1) is required for the sole purpose of meeting unusual variations in cost, and (2) could not have been reasonably anticipated at the time such estimate was submitted to the Congress. However, the total cost of all construction and acquisition in each such title may not exceed the total amount authorized to be appropriated in that title.

(b) When the amount named for any construction or acquisition in title I, II, III, or

IV of this Act involves only one project at any military installation and the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, determines that the amount authorized must be increased by more than the applicable percentage prescribed in subsection (a), the Secretary concerned may proceed with such construction or acquisition if the amount of the increase does not exceed by more than 25 per centum the amount named for such project by the Congress.

(c) Subject to the limitations contained in subsection (a), no individual project authorized under title I, II, III, or IV of this Act for any specifically listed military installation may be placed under contract if—

(1) the estimated cost of such project is \$250,000 or more, and

(2) the current working estimate of the Department of Defense, based upon bids received, for the construction of such project exceeds by more than 25 per centum the amount authorized for such project by the Congress, until after the expiration of thirty days from the date on which a written report of the facts relating to the increased cost of such project, including a statement of the reasons for such increase has been submitted to the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

(d) The Secretary of Defense shall submit an annual report to the Congress identifying each individual project which has been placed under contract in the preceding twelve-month period and with respect to which the then current working estimate of the Department of Defense based upon bids received for such project exceeded the amount authorized by the Congress for that project by more than 25 per centum. The Secretary shall also include in such report each individual project with respect to which the scope was reduced in order to permit contract award within the available authorization for such project. Such report shall include all pertinent cost information for each individual project, including the amount in dollars and percentage by which the current working estimate based on the contract price for the project exceeded the amount authorized for such project by the Congress.

Sec. 604. Contracts for construction made by the United States for performance within the United States and its possessions under this Act shall be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, or the Naval Facilities Command, Department of the Navy, or such other department or Government agency as the Secretaries of the military departments recommend and the Secretary of Defense approves to assure the most efficient, expeditious, and cost-effective accomplishment of the construction herein authorized. The Secretaries of the military departments shall report annually to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives a breakdown of the dollar value of construction contracts completed by each of the several construction agencies selected together with the design, construction supervision, and overhead fees charged by each of the several agents in the execution of the assigned construction. Further such contracts (except architect and engineering contracts which, unless specifically authorized by the Congress shall continue to be awarded in accordance with presently established procedures, customs, and practice) shall be awarded, insofar as practicable, on a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, if the national security will not be impaired and the award is consistent with chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code. The Secretaries of the military departments shall report annually to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives with respect to all contracts awarded on other than a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder.

SEC. 605. As of October 1, 1975, all authorizations for military public works including family housing, to be accomplished by the Secretary of a military department in connection with the establishment or development of military installations and facilities, and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are contained in titles I, II, III, IV, and V of the Act of November 29, 1973, Public Law 93-166 (87 Stat. 661), and all such authorizations contained in Acts approved before November 30, 1973, and not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authorization are repealed except—

(1) authorizations for public works and for appropriations therefor that are set forth in those Acts in the titles that contain the general provisions;

(2) authorizations for public works projects as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construction contracts, land acquisition, or payments to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, in whole or in part before October 1, 1975, and authorizations for appropriations therefor;

(3) notwithstanding the repeal provisions of section 605 of the Act of November 29, 1973, Public Law 93-166, 87 Stat. 661, 681), authorizations for the following items which shall remain in effect until October 1, 1976:

(a) Sanitary sewer connection in the amount of \$2,200,000 at Fort Belvoir, Virginia, that is contained in title I, section 101 of the Act of October 26, 1970 (84 Stat. 1204), as amended and extended in section 705(a) (3)(A) of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1153).

(b) Cold storage warehouse construction in the amount of \$1,215,000 at Fort Dix, New Jersey, that is contained in title I, section 101 of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1135), as amended.

(c) Enlisted men's barracks complex construction in the amount of \$12,160,000 at Fort Knox, Kentucky, that is contained in title I, section 101 of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1135), as amended.

(d) Enlisted women's barracks construction in the amount of \$245,000 and bachelor officer's quarters construction in the amount of \$803,000 at Fort Lee, Virginia, that is contained in title I, section 101 of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1135), as amended.

(e) Chapel center construction in the amount of \$1,088,000 at Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana, that is contained in title I, section 101 of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1135), as amended.

(f) Enlisted men's barracks construction in the amount of \$7,996,000 at Ford Ord, California, that is contained in title I, section 101 of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1135), as amended.

(g) Enlisted men's barracks and mess construction in the amount of \$699,000 at Sierra Army Depot, California, that is contained in title I, section 101 of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1136), as amended.

(h) Test facilities Solid State Radar in the amount of \$7,600,000 at Kwajalein National Missile Range, Kwajalein, that is contained in title I, section 101 of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1137).

(i) Land acquisition in the amount of \$10,000,000 for the Naval Ammunition Depot, Oahu, Hawaii, that is contained in title II, section 201 of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1140).

(j) Message center addition, aircraft fire and crash station, aircraft maintenance hanger shops, bachelor enlisted quarters, mess hall, bachelor officers' quarters, exchange and recreation building, and utilities construction in the amounts of \$110,000; \$199,000; \$837,000; \$1,745,000; \$377,000; \$829,000; \$419,000; and \$792,000 respectively for the Naval Detachment, Souda Bay, Crete, Greece that is contained in title II, section 201 of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1141).

(k) Authorization for exchange of lands in support of the Air Installation Compatible Use Zones at Various Locations in the amount of \$12,000,000 that is contained in title III, section 301 of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1145), as amended.

(4) Notwithstanding the repeal provisions of section 705(b) of the Act of October 25, 1972, Public Law 92-545 (86 Stat. 1135, 1153), as modified by section 605(3) of the Act of November 29, 1973, Public Law 93-166 (87 Stat. 661, 681), the authorization to construct 600 family housing units at Naval Complex, Norfolk, Virginia, contained in title V, section 501(b) of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1148) shall remain in effect until October 1, 1975.

SEC. 606. None of the authority contained in titles I, II, III, and IV of this Act shall be deemed to authorize any building construction projects inside the United States in excess of a unit cost to be determined in proportion to the appropriate area construction cost index, based on the following unit cost limitations where the area construction index is 1.0:

(1) \$28.50 per square foot for permanent barracks;

(2) \$30.50 per square foot for bachelor officer quarters;

unless the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, determines that because of special circumstances, application to such project of the limitations on unit costs contained in this section is impracticable: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding the limitations contained in prior military construction authorization Acts on unit costs, the limitations on such costs contained in this section shall apply to all prior authorization for such construction not heretofore repealed and for which construction contracts have not been awarded by the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 607. Section 612 of Public Law 89-568 (80 Stat. 756, 757), is amended by deleting the figure \$150,000 wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof \$225,000.

SEC. 608. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, proceeds from the sale of recyclable material shall be credited first, to the cost of collection, handling and sale of the material including purchasing of equipment to be used for recycling purposes and second, to projects for environmental improvement and energy conservation at camps, posts, and bases establishing recycling programs in accordance with regulations approved by the Secretary of Defense. The amount expended for environmental improvement and energy conservation projects shall not exceed \$50,000 per installation per annum. Any balance shall be returned to the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. The Secretary of each military department shall make an annual report to Congress on the operation of the program.

SEC. 609. (a) The Secretary of the Navy, or his designee, is authorized to convey to the Gulf Coast Council, Boy Scouts of America, for fair market value and subject to such terms and conditions as shall be determined by the Secretary of the Navy, or his designee, to be necessary to protect the interests of the United States, all right, title, and interest of the United States of America, other than mineral rights including gas and oil which shall be reserved to the United States, in and to a certain parcel of land containing 12.46 acres, more or less, situated in Escambia County, Florida, being a part of the Naval Education and Training Program Development Center, Ellyson, Florida, more particularly described as follows:

Commence at the southeast property corner of Naval Education and Training Program Development Center (NETPDC), formerly Naval Air Station, Ellyson,

thence north 3 degrees 55 minutes west along the east boundary of NETPDC a dis-

tance of 725.8 feet more or less to the point of beginning; from said point of beginning, continue north 3 degrees 55 minutes west along the east boundary of NETPDC a distance of 829.1 feet more or less to a point,

thence north 0 degrees 27 minutes west along the east boundary of NETPDC a distance of 623.3 feet more or less to a point, thence south 45 degrees 25 minutes east a distance of 304.8 feet more or less to a point,

thence south 87 degrees 48 minutes east a distance of 40.5 feet more or less to a point, thence south 0 degree 25 minutes west a distance of 38.1 feet more or less to a point, thence south 45 degrees 25 minutes east a distance of 139.8 feet more or less to a point,

thence south 87 degrees 00 minutes east a distance of 24.6 feet more or less to a point,

thence south 24 degrees 12 minutes west a distance of 17.4 feet more or less to a point,

thence south 45 degrees 25 minutes east a distance of 536.6 feet more or less to a point,

thence south 44 degrees 35 minutes west a distance of 990.1 feet more or less to the point of beginning, containing 12.46 acres more or less.

(b) All expenses for surveys and the preparation and execution of legal documents necessary or appropriate to carry out the foregoing provisions shall be borne by the Gulf Coast Council, Boy Scouts of America.

SEC. 610. (a) The Secretary of Defense is authorized and directed to assist counties and communities located near the Trident Support Site Bangor, Washington, in meeting the costs of providing increased municipal services and facilities to the residents of such areas, if the Secretary determines that there is a substantial increase in the need for such services and facilities as a direct result of work being carried out in connection with the construction, installation, testing, and operation of the Trident Weapon System and that an excessive financial burden will be incurred by such governmental entities as a result of the increased need for such services and facilities.

(b) The Secretary of Defense shall carry out the provisions of this section through existing Federal programs. The Secretary is authorized to supplement funds made available under such Federal programs to the extent necessary to carry out the provisions of this section, and is authorized to provide financial assistance to governmental entities described in subsection (a) of this section to help such entities pay their share of the costs under such programs. The heads of all departments and agencies concerned shall cooperate fully with the Secretary of Defense in carrying out the provisions of this section on a priority basis.

(c) In determining the amount of financial assistance to be made available under this section for any service or facility, the Secretary of Defense shall consult with the head of the department or agency of the Federal Government concerned with the type of service or facility for which financial assistance is being made available and shall take into consideration (1) the time lag between the initial impact of increased population in any area and any increase in the local tax base which will result from such increased population, (2) the possible temporary nature of the increased population and the long-range cost impact on the permanent residents of any such area and (3) such other pertinent factors as the Secretary of Defense deems appropriate.

SEC. 611. Section 2662 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end of subsection (a) a new paragraph:

"(6) Any termination or modification by either the grantor or grantee of an existing license or permit of real property owned by the United States to a military department, under which substantial investment has been or are proposed to be made in connec-

tion with the use of the property by the military department."

SEC. 612. (a) The Secretary of the Army, or his designee, is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed to the State of Louisiana all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to that certain real property located in Saint Tammany Parish, Louisiana, containing one thousand seven hundred and ten acres, more or less, known as Camp Villere, being the same property presently under license to the State for National Guard use, and known as Audited Installation Numbered 22975 in the files of the Office of the District Engineer, Corps of Engineers, Fort Worth District.

(b) The conveyance required to be made pursuant to paragraph (a) shall be made without monetary compensation but shall be in consideration of, and subject to, the following terms and conditions:

(1) The conveyed property shall be used primarily for the training of the Louisiana National Guard and for other military purposes of the Louisiana National Guard.

(2) Any revenue derived by the State from any other uses of the property shall be used for the maintenance and improvement of the property or be shared with the United States as prescribed by the Secretary. The State shall maintain such records and furnish such reports with respect to such revenue as are prescribed by the Secretary.

(3) The State shall protect the timber, water resources, gravel, sand, soil mineral deposits, and other natural resources of the conveyed property in accordance with sound conservation practices and to the satisfaction of the Secretary.

(4) In time of war or national emergency declared by the Congress, or national emergency hereafter proclaimed by the President, and upon a determination by the Secretary of Defense that the conveyed property, or any part thereof, is useful or necessary for national defense and security, the Secretary, on behalf of the United States, shall have the right to enter upon and use such property, or any part thereof (including any and all improvements made thereon by the State), for a period not to exceed the duration of such war or emergency plus six months. Upon termination of such use, the property shall revert to the State, together with all improvements placed thereon by the United States, and be subject to the terms, conditions, and limitations on its use and disposition which apply without regard to this paragraph. The use of the property by the United States pursuant to this paragraph shall be without obligation or payment on the part of the United States, except that the United States, if required by the State, shall pay the fair market rental value for the use of any improvements on the property which are constructed with State funds and, upon completion of such use, will restore any such improvements to the same condition as that existing at the time of initial occupancy by the United States under this paragraph. At the option of the Secretary, cash payment may be made by the United States in lieu of such restoration; except that the value of any improvements erected by the United States during its occupancy and left on the property shall be offset against the obligation of the United States to restore improvements constructed with State funds.

(5) There shall be reserved from the conveyance such easements and right-of-way for roads, water flowage, soil disposal, waterlines, sewerlines, communications wires, powerlines, and other purposes, as the Secretary considers necessary or convenient for the operations, activities, and functions of the United States.

(6) All mineral rights with respect to the conveyed property, including gas and oil, shall be reserved to the United States, together with the right to permit such reasonable exploration and mining operations as

will not interfere with the primary use of the property.

(7) Such other terms and conditions as the Secretary may deem necessary to protect the interests of the United States.

(c) Upon a finding by the Secretary that the State is violating or failing to comply with any term or condition imposed by subparagraph (1), (2), or (3) of paragraph (b) of this section, the Secretary is authorized immediately to reenter and take possession of the property described in paragraph (a), whereupon title to such property shall revert to the United States and control thereover may be asserted by the Secretary without any further act or legal proceeding whatsoever. Any improvements, fixtures, and buildings placed on the property by the State during its period of use shall become the property of the United States without payment of compensation therefor.

(d) (1) Any surveying and related costs incurred incident to the carrying out of this section shall be borne by the State.

(2) Appropriate provisions to implement the terms and conditions of this Act shall be included in the instrument of conveyance.

SEC. 613. Titles I, II, III, IV, V, and VI, of this Act may be cited as the "Military Construction Authorization Act, 1975".

Mr. PIKE (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title VI be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 37, line 18, strike out the figure \$545,813,000" and substitute the figure "\$545,873,000".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title VI? If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE VII

RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

SEC. 701. Subject to chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense may establish or develop additional facilities for the Reserve Forces, including the acquisition of land therefor, but the cost of such facilities shall not exceed—

(1) For the Department of the Army: (a) Army National Guard of the United States, \$53,800,000.

(b) Army Reserve, \$38,600,000.

(2) For the Department of the Navy: Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, \$19,867,000.

(3) For the Department of the Air Force:

(a) Air National Guard of the United States, \$26,000,000.

(b) Air Force Reserve, \$14,000,000.

SEC. 702. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop installations and facilities under this title without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529), and sections 4774 and 9774 of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on lands includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U.S.C. 255), and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make

surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

SEC. 703. Chapter 133, title 10, United States Code, as amended, is further amended by striking out the figure "\$50,000" in paragraph (1) of section 2233a, Limitation, and inserting the figure "\$100,000" in place thereof.

SEC. 704. This title may be cited as the "Reserve Forces Facilities Authorization Act, 1975".

Mr. PIKE (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title VII be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to title VII? If not, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. STEED, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 16136) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 1297, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 322, nays 30, not voting 82, as follows:

[Roll No. 472]

YEAS—322

Abdnor	Brinkley	Collins, Ill.
Adams	Brooks	Collins, Tex.
Alexander	Broomfield	Conable
Anderson	Brotzman	Conlan
Calif.	Brown, Calif.	Conte
Anderson, Ill.	Brown, Mich.	Corman
Andrews, N.C.	Brown, Ohio	Cotter
Andrews,	Broyhill, N.C.	Coughlin
N. Dak.	Broyhill, Va.	Crane
Annunzio	Buchanan	Cronin
Archer	Burgener	Daniel, Dan
Arends	Burke, Calif.	Daniel, Robert
Ashbrook	Burke, Fla.	W., Jr.
Ashley	Burke, Mass.	Daniels,
Aspin	Burleson, Tex.	Dominick V.
Bafalis	Burlison, Mo.	Danielson
Barrett	Butler	Davis, S.C.
Bauman	Byron	Davis, Wis.
Beard	Camp	Delaney
Bell	Carter	Dellenback
Bennett	Casey, Tex.	Denholm
Bergland	Chamberlain	Dennis
Bevill	Chappell	Dent
Blester	Clancy	Derwinski
Blackburn	Clark	Devine
Boiland	Clausen,	Dickinson
Bolling	Don H.	Dingell
Brademas	Cleveland	Dorn
Bray	Cochran	Downing
Breckinridge	Cohen	Duncan
	Collier	du Pont

Eckhardt	Long, La.	Roush
Edwards, Ala.	Long, Md.	Roussellot
Ellberg	Lujan	Roy
Erlenborn	McClary	Runnels
Eshleman	McCloskey	Ruppe
Evans, Colo.	McCollister	Ruth
Evins, Tenn.	McCormack	St Germain
Fasell	McDade	Sandman
Findley	McEwen	Sarasin
Fish	McFall	Sarbanes
Fisher	McKinney	Satterfield
Flood	Macdonald	Schroeder
Flowers	Madden	Sebellus
Foley	Madigan	Seiberling
Ford	Mahon	Shipley
Forsythe	Mann	Shoup
Fountain	Martin, Nebr.	Shriver
Frelinghuysen	Martin, N.C.	Shuster
Frey	Mathias, Calif.	Sikes
Fruehlich	Mathis, Ga.	Slisk
Gaydos	Matsunaga	Skubitz
Gettys	Mayne	Slack
Gialmo	Mazzoli	Smith, Iowa
Gilman	Meeds	Smith, N.Y.
Ginn	Mezvisky	Spence
Goldwater	Michel	Staggers
Gonzalez	Minish	Stanton
Green, Pa.	Mink	J. William
Gross	Mitchell, N.Y.	Steed
Grover	Mizell	Steele
Gude	Moakley	Steelman
Gunter	Mollohan	Steiger, Ariz.
Guyer	Moorhead,	Steiger, Wis.
Haley	Calif.	Stratton
Hamilton	Moorhead, Pa.	Stubblefield
Hammer-	Morgan	Studds
schmidt	Mosher	Sullivan
Hanley	Moss	Symington
Hanna	Murtha	Symms
Hanrahan	Myers	Talcott
Hastings	Natcher	Taylor, Mo.
Hébert	Nedzi	Taylor, N.C.
Heckler, Mass.	Nelsen	Thomson, Wis.
Heinz	Nichols	Thornton
Henderson	Nix	Tiernan
Hicks	Obey	Towell, Nev.
Hillis	O'Hara	Traxler
Hinshaw	O'Neill	Ullman
Holt	Parris	Van Deerlin
Horton	Passman	Vander Veen
Hosmer	Patman	Veysey
Howard	Patten	Vigorito
Huber	Perkins	Waggonner
Hudnut	Pettis	Walsh
Hungate	Peyser	Wampler
Hunt	Pickle	Whalen
Hutchinson	Pike	White
Ichord	Poage	Whitehurst
Jarman	Preyer	Whitten
Johnson, Calif.	Price, Ill.	Whitnall
Johnson, Colo.	Price, Tex.	Wilson
Johnson, Pa.	Quillen	Charles H.,
Jones, Ala.	Railsback	Calif.
Jones, N.C.	Randall	Winn
Jones, Okla.	Regula	Wolf
Jones, Tenn.	Reuss	Wright
Jordan	Rhodes	Wyatt
Karth	Riegle	Wylder
Kazen	Rinaldo	Wylie
Kemp	Roberts	Yates
Ketchum	Robinson, Va.	Yatron
King	Robison, N.Y.	Young, Alaska
Kluczynski	Rodino	Young, Fla.
Koch	Roe	Young, Ill.
Kuykendall	Rogers	Young, S.C.
Lagomarsino	Roncallo, Wyo.	Young, Tex.
Latta	Roncallo, N.Y.	Zablocki
Leggett	Rooney, Pa.	Zion
Lehman	Rose	Zwack
Litton	Rostenkowski	

NAYS—30

Abzug	Frenzel	Pritchard
Badillo	Harrington	Rangel
Bingham	Hechler, W. Va.	Rosenthal
Burton, John	Helstoski	Roybal
Burton, Phillip	Holtzman	Ryan
Carney, Ohio	Kastenmeier	Stark
Clay	Landgrebe	Stokes
Drinan	Luken	Vanik
Edwards, Calif.	Metcalfe	Waldie
Fraser	Miller	Young, Ga.

NOT VOTING—82

Addabbo	Clawson, Del	Fulton
Armstrong	Conyers	Fuqua
Baker	Culver	Gibbons
Blaggi	Davis, Ga.	Goodling
Blatnik	de la Garza	Grasso
Bowen	Dellums	Gray
Brasco	Diggs	Green, Oreg.
Breaux	Donohue	Griffiths
Carey, N.Y.	Dulski	Gubser
Cederberg	Esch	Hansen, Idaho
Chisholm	Flynt	Hansen, Wash.

Harsha	Mitchell, Md.	Stanton,
Hawkins	Montgomery	James V.
Hays	Murphy, Ill.	Stephens
Hogan	Murphy, N.Y.	Stuckey
Hollifield	O'Brien	Teague
Kyros	Owens	Thompson, N.J.
Landrum	Pepper	Thone
Lent	Podell	Treen
Lott	Powell, Ohio	Udall
McKay	Quie	Vander Jagt
McSpadden	Rarick	Ware
Mallory	Rees	Wiggins
Maraziti	Reid	Williams
Melcher	Rooney, N.Y.	Wilson, Bob
Milford	Scherle	Wilson,
Mills	Schneebell	Charles, Tex.
Minshall, Ohio	Snyder	Wyman

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Murphy of New York for, with Mr. Mitchell of Maryland against.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey for, with Mrs. Chisholm against.
Mr. Addabbo for, with Mr. Hawkins against.
Mr. Teague for, with Mr. Conyers against.
Mr. Podell for, with Mr. Dellums against.
Mr. Blaggy for, with Mr. Dicks against.
Mr. Kyros for, with Mr. Rees against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Montgomery with Mr. Baker.
Mr. Breaux with Mr. Esch.
Mr. Carey of New York with Mrs. Green of Oregon.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. Rarick with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. de la Garza with Mr. Harsha.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Blatnik.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Mallory.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Hogan.
Mr. McSpadden with Mr. Goodling.
Mr. Dulski with Mrs. Griffiths.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Owens.
Mr. Reid with Mr. Del Clawson.
Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Minshall of Ohio.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Maraziti.
Mr. Murphy of Illinois with Mr. O'Brien.
Mrs. Grasso with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Powell of Ohio.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Scherle.
Mr. Culver with Mr. Lent.
Mr. Charles Wilson of Texas with Mr. Quie.
Mr. Hollifield with Mr. Treen.
Mr. McKay with Mr. Schneebell.
Mr. Udall with Mr. Lott.
Mr. Melcher with Mr. Thone.
Mr. Bowen with Mr. Snyder.
Mr. Fulton with Mr. Ware.
Mr. Gibbons with Mr. Wiggins.
Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Wyman.
Mr. Mills with Mr. Williams.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. James V. Stanton with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 108. Concurrent resolution extending best wishes to President Gerald R. Ford.

PERMISSION FOR THE COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE A PRIVILEGED REPORT

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file privileged reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENDING THE BEST WISHES OF THE CONGRESS TO PRESIDENT GERALD R. FORD

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 108) extending the best wishes of the Congress to President Gerald R. Ford.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 108

Whereas Gerald R. Ford was a Member of Congress for twenty-five years; and
Whereas he is known to the Congress as a good and faithful friend; and

Whereas he assumes today the Office of President of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress extends to Gerald R. Ford its sincere best wishes, its assurances of firm cooperation and its fervent hopes for success in office.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Senate concurrent resolution.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device; and there were—yeas 329, nays 0, not voting 105, as follows:

[Roll No 473]

YEAS—329

Abdnor	Bennett	Buchanan
Abzug	Bergland	Burgener
Adams	Bevill	Burke, Fla.
Alexander	Blester	Burleson, Tex.
Anderson,	Bingham	Burlison, Mo.
Calif.	Blackburn	Burton, John
Anderson, Ill.	Boggs	Burton, Phillip
Andrews, N.C.	Boland	Butler
Andrews,	Bolling	Byron
N. Dak.	Brademas	Camp
Annunzio	Bray	Carter
Archer	Breckinridge	Casey, Tex.
Arends	Brinkley	Chamberlain
Ashbrook	Brooks	Chappell
Aspin	Brotzman	Clancy
Badillo	Brown, Calif.	Clausen,
Baflis	Brown, Mich.	Don H.
Bauman	Brown, Ohio	Clay
Beard	Broyhill, N.C.	Cleveland
Bell	Broyhill, Va.	Cochran

Cohen	Hungate	Rhodes
Collier	Hunt	Rinaldo
Collins, Ill.	Ichord	Roberts
Collins, Tex.	Jarman	Robinson, Va.
Conable	Johnson, Calif.	Robinson, N.Y.
Conlan	Johnson, Colo.	Rodino
Conte	Johnson, Pa.	Roe
Corman	Jones, N.C.	Rogers
Coughlin	Jones, Tenn.	Roncalio, Wyo.
Crane	Jordan	Roncalio, N.Y.
Cronin	Karth	Rooney, Pa.
Daniel, Dan	Kastenmeier	Rosenthal
Daniel, Robert	Kazen	Rostenkowski
W., Jr.	Kemp	Roush
Daniels,	Ketchum	Rousselot
Dominick V.	King	Roy
Danielson	Kluczynski	Roybal
Davis, S.C.	Koch	Runnels
Davis, Wis.	Kuykendall	Ruppe
Delaney	Lagomarsino	Ruth
Dellenback	Landgrebe	St Germain
Denholm	Latta	Sandman
Dennis	Lehman	Sarasin
Dent	Litton	Sarbanes
Derwinski	Long, La.	Satterfield
Devine	Long, Md.	Schroeder
Dickinson	Lujan	Seiberling
Dingell	Lukens	Shirley
Dorn	McClory	Shoup
Downing	McCollister	Shriver
Duncan	McCormack	Shuster
du Pont	McDade	Slkes
Eckhardt	McEwen	Sisk
Edwards, Ala.	McFall	Skubitz
Edwards, Calif.	McKinney	Smith, Iowa
Ellberg	Macdonald	Smith, N.Y.
Erlenborn	Madden	Spence
Eshleman	Madigan	Staggers
Evins, Tenn.	Mahon	Stanton,
Fascel	Mann	J. William
Findley	Martin, Nebr.	Stanton,
Fish	Martin, N.C.	James V.
Fisher	Mathias, Calif.	Stark
Flood	Mathis, Ga.	Steed
Flowers	Matunaga	Steele
Foley	Mayne	Steelman
Ford	Mazzoli	Steiger, Ariz.
Forsythe	Meeds	Steiger, Wis.
Fountain	Metcalfe	Stratton
Fraser	Mezvisinsky	Stubblefield
Frelinghuysen	Michel	Studds
Frenzel	Miller	Sullivan
Frey	Minish	Symington
Froehlich	Mink	Symms
Fuqua	Mitchell, N.Y.	Talcott
Gaydos	Mizell	Taylor, Mo.
Gettys	Moakley	Taylor, N.C.
Glaime	Mollohan	Thomson, Wis.
Gilman	Moorhead,	Tieman
Ginn	Calif.	Towell, Nev.
Goldwater	Moorhead, Pa.	Traxler
Gonzalez	Morgan	Ullman
Green, Pa.	Mosher	Van Derlin
Gross	Moss	Vander Veen
Grover	Murtha	Vanik
Gude	Myers	Veysey
Gunter	Natcher	Vigorito
Guyar	Nedzi	Waggonner
Haley	Nelsen	Waldie
Hammer-	Nix	Walsh
schmidt	Obey	Wampler
Hanley	O'Hara	Whalen
Hanna	O'Neill	White
Hanrahan	Parris	Whitehurst
Harrington	Passman	Whitten
Hastings	Patman	Widnall
Hawkins	Patten	Winn
Hébert	Pepper	Wolff
Hechler, W. Va.	Perkins	Wright
Heckler, Mass.	Pettis	Wyatt
Heinz	Peyser	Wydler
Helstoski	Pickle	Wylie
Henderson	Pike	Yatron
Hicks	Poage	Young, Alaska
Hillis	Preyer	Young, Fla.
Hinshaw	Price, Ill.	Young, Ga.
Holt	Price, Tex.	Young, Ill.
Holtzman	Pritchard	Young, S.C.
Horton	Railsback	Young, Tex.
Hosmer	Randall	Zablocki
Howard	Rangel	Zion
Huber	Regula	Zwach
Hudnut	Reuss	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—105

Addabbo	Breaux	Clawson, Del
Armstrong	Broomfield	Conyers
Ashley	Burke, Calif.	Cotter
Baker	Burke, Mass.	Culver
Barrett	Carey, N.Y.	Davis, Ga.
Biaggi	Carney, Ohio	de la Garza
Blatnik	Cederberg	Dellums
Bowen	Chisholm	Diggs
Brasco	Clark	Donohue

Drinan	Lott	Ryan
Dulski	McCloskey	Scherle
Esch	McKay	Schneebeli
Evans, Colo.	McSpadden	Sebellus
Flynt	Mallory	Slack
Fulton	Maraziti	Snyder
Gibbons	Melcher	Stephens
Goodling	Milford	Stokes
Grasso	Mills	Stuckey
Gray	Minshall, Ohio	Teague
Green, Oreg.	Mitchell, Md.	Thompson, N.J.
Griffiths	Montgomery	Thone
Gubser	Murphy, Ill.	Thornton
Hamilton	Murphy, N.Y.	Treen
Hansen, Idaho	Nichols	Udall
Hansen, Wash.	O'Brien	Vander Jagt
Harsha	Owens	Ware
Hays	Podell	Wiggins
Hogan	Powell, Ohio	Williams
Holifield	Quile	Wilson, Bob
Hutchinson	Quillen	Wilson,
Jones, Ala.	Rarick	Charles H.,
Jones, Okla.	Rees	Calif.
Kyros	Reid	Wilson,
Landrum	Riegle	Charles, Tex.
Leggett	Rooney, N.Y.	Wyman
Lent	Rose	Yates

So the Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR A JOINT SESSION OF THE TWO HOUSES ON MONDAY, AUGUST 12, 1974, TO RECEIVE A MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 594) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 594

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Monday, August 12, 1974, at 9 p.m. for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE RECESSES ON MONDAY NEXT

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next the Speaker be authorized to declare recesses, subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF AUGUST 12, 1974

(Mr. RHODES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the distinguished majority leader to inform the House, if he is in a position to do so, as to the program for the balance of this week and the program for next week; and if possible, as to any plans the leadership might have for an August recess.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. RHODES. I am happy to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I shall be happy to respond to the distinguished minority leader.

The program for the House of Representatives for the week of August 12, 1974, is as follows:

Monday is District day, no bills. We will take up H.R. 14214, the health revenue sharing and health services, with an open rule and 1 hour of debate.

Following that, we will take up H.R. 5529, motor vehicle and schoolbus safety amendments, with an open rule and 1 hour of debate.

Following that, we will have S. 1728, War Claims Act Amendment, open rule and 1 hour of debate.

We will have a joint session at 9 p.m. to hear the President of the United States.

On Tuesday, we will take up H.R. 15544, Treasury-Postal Service appropriations, fiscal year 1975, conference report. Following that, H.R. 15155, conference report on public works appropriations, fiscal year 1975.

Then, H.R. 15405, conference report on Transportation appropriations, fiscal year 1975.

Then, we will take up H.R. 15264, Export Administration Act, open rule with 1 hour of debate.

This is the bill which was to have followed the military construction bill today but has been put over to next Tuesday.

On Wednesday, we will have H.R. 9989, real estate settlement procedures, with an open rule and 1 hour of debate. Following that, H.R. 12859, Federal mass transportation, subject to a rule being granted.

On Thursday and the balance of the week we will have:

H.R. 2, pension reform, conference report;

S. 3066, Housing and Urban Development, conference report;

H.R. 16168, State Department authorization, subject to a rule being granted; and

H.R. 15487, foreign investment study, under an open rule, with 1 hour of debate.

Conference reports may be brought up at any time and any further program will be announced later.

At the present time, unless an emergency arises, we are not planning a Friday session for next week.

The minority leader asked a question with respect to the recess. After talking with the President of the United States and asking what his plans for the immediate future would be, it has been decided by the leadership on both sides of the aisle that at the close of business on Thursday, August 22, we will go into recess until noon Wednesday, September 11.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the majority leader.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, AUGUST 12, 1974

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House ad-

journs today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule on Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THE RESIGNATION OF PRESIDENT RICHARD M. NIXON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EDWARDS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, today at noon Richard M. Nixon resigned as the 37th President of the United States and Gerald R. Ford was sworn in as the 38th President. Like most of you, I have mixed emotions about this unique period in our Nation's history.

What is there to say? What's done is done and I am greatly saddened by it all. Richard Nixon has been my friend and I will remember that. I will remember him as the President who ended the war in Vietnam, and brought our POW's home; who made the first giant strides toward open relations with China and Russia; who has done so much to diffuse the tinder box in the Middle East; and who, as a consequence of all this, has started us on the road to a generation of peace without the need to continue drafting our young men. I will remember a President who made the people of the South feel that they had a President who cared about them. And I will remember him as the first President to provide for construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway. He even put his personal support behind this important project by coming to Mobile in 1971 to help us commemorate the start of construction.

Yes, I am very sad today that things have turned out as they have. But, I will remember the best in Richard Nixon, including his decision that resignation would be in the best interest of his country.

Now we can put behind us the obsession with Watergate and all its connotations as bad as they were, and get on with the pressing problems facing our Nation.

We know President Ford in this House. We know him as an excellent legislator who served here for some 25 years—about 9 of those years as minority leader. We know him as Vice President of the United States, and now our very good friend has risen to the highest office in the land. I have a tremendous respect for his ability to provide this country with great leadership. I believe he will get

us moving again and I pledge him my full support.

PRESIDENT NIXON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have just watched President Nixon leave the White House. Like millions of Americans, I am very sad—as though a member of my family had just passed away.

As he said his goodbys, Richard Nixon wept. I pray to God that President Nixon's tears could be joined with the oceans of tears wept this day throughout our land to flow across America like the tide, washing away bitterness and hate wherever it might dwell.

My respect for Richard Nixon and the unselfish ways in which he served his country is in no way diminished.

If we do, in fact, enjoy the generation of peace, which he so sincerely sought, it will only be because of his dedicated efforts.

His place in history is preserved as long as history itself is preserved. History will record that Richard Nixon ended America's involvement in our longest and costliest war—a war in Vietnam that was begun by someone else.

History will record that it was Richard Nixon who ended the "cold war" which kept the threat of nuclear destruction ever present in our lives for nearly three decades.

With so many outstanding accomplishments to his credit, then how do we explain this dramatic heartbreaking end to such an illustrious public career?

There is so much involved in this national tragedy that it staggers the imagination. It is impossible to effectively explain how circumstances of this magnitude could have gotten out of control—but there is no doubt—get out of control they did.

Maybe we expect too much from our Presidents—we elect them, then we expect them to wave a magic wand, immediately curing all the ills of the Nation and the world. But, rather than help our Presidents face the challenges, too many lurk for every opportunity to criticize, to accuse, to attack.

What we sometimes demand of our Presidents would require not only all the power of a total dictator, but even some of God's own divine power. And yet, often when a President attempts to do that which we demand, using only the human resources available to him, the attackers begin.

God has a plan—a purpose for our Nation—a plan that requires a certain unity on the part of Americans. Maybe in that plan Richard Nixon was destined to be a sacrifice—a sacrifice that would bring us to our senses—a sacrifice that would make us realize what we have been doing to ourselves in recent years.

Since the early 1960's, this Nation has been wracked by turmoil, discord, disunity, heartbreak, and pain. The list is long: The assassination of President Kennedy, the assassination of Senator Robert Kennedy; the assassination of

Martin Luther King; the attempted assassination of Presidential candidate, Gov. George Wallace; the driving from office of President Lyndon B. Johnson; the riots that have destroyed so much private and public property; the burning and looting of some of our Nation's cities; explosion of a bomb in the Capitol of the United States; attempts to shut down our National Government through violence and take over of Federal buildings in Washington, D.C.; the campaign to try to convince us that "God is dead;" and the hate and rancor that has too often spilled over on the floors of Congress. These, plus the lack of trust between people in government, added to accusations and convictions of leaders in high councils of government, including Members of Congress on charges of corruption, are distressing revelations of our times.

Maybe Richard Nixon was destined to be a sacrifice to teach us that Presidents, although expected to perform superhuman tasks, are themselves only human.

Yes, human, with the same feelings, the same desires, the same emotions, and the same faults that every one of us have.

Our Presidents need our help—not our hate. Our Presidents need our compassion—not our vindictiveness. Our Presidents need our understanding—not our condemnation.

MOMENTOUS EVENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOGAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, the events of recent days are among the most momentous in this Nation's history.

Richard Nixon has become the first President of the United States to resign his office before completing his term, and Gerald Ford has become the first President of the United States to ascend to that great office without having first been a candidate for national office.

For millions of Americans, whose emotions and passions have been spent in the course of this long turmoil of the spirit, this is a time of both sorrow and relief.

Mr. Nixon's decision to resign his office, rather than subject the Nation to the ordeal of an impeachment trial, is an admirable and patriotic act which merits the praise and the respect of all Americans.

Throughout the course of his long and eventful career, Richard Nixon has served his country with great skill and dedication, and his many accomplishments—especially in working toward a safer and more peaceful world—will be long remembered and deeply appreciated by millions of people, here at home and around the globe.

And the Nation will soon come to know Gerald Ford, as I have known him, as a man of the highest integrity, as a Government leader of great talent and industry, as a patriot who loves his country deeply and who proclaims that love unashamedly.

He brings to the Presidency outstanding gifts of training and temperament which, I believe, will serve him and serve

the country well during his tenure in this high office.

As we move through this sad but orderly transition of leadership, the weaknesses common to men and the strength inherent in the law stand in sharp contrast. And if we learn no other lesson from this time of personal tragedy and national trial, we must learn anew—and teach our children—that our greatest faith and our highest allegiance must be with the law and the Constitution, which have sustained us and saved our Nation.

We cannot tie ourselves and our country to the fortunes of one man alone, for we know now beyond doubt that if he goes astray, our own path as a people will be fraught with uncertainty and peril.

It is symbolic of the strength of this Republic that an orderly transfer of power can be accomplished with dignity and statesmanship, and as we move forward under President Ford's leadership, let us pray that our strength will sustain us, that goodwill may banish rancor from our land, that compassion may rule our hearts, and that the future may bring a welcome peace to the American soul.

HOUSE ACTION NECESSARY ON IMPEACHMENT ARTICLES AND EVIDENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McFALL). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BINGHAM) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, listening to Mr. Nixon's resignation statement last night, I felt pride in the strength and integrity of the American constitutional system. For this resignation was the equivalent of a removal of the President from his office by the Congress because of high crimes and misdemeanors. It was not, as Mr. Nixon claimed, a voluntary resignation; it was a resignation forced by the circumstance that Mr. Nixon had been informed the day before that he had no chance to escape impeachment and removal by the House and the Senate.

But I also felt shame that a President of the United States could still apparently feel no contrition for the disgrace he had brought to his high office or the damage he had done to the confidence of the American people in their system of government. Those feelings are tempered by appreciation and relief for Mr. Nixon's graceful, orderly passing of power. There was no lashing out at enemies or bitter statements. This sense of relief combines with brighter hopes for the future and an eagerness to return to working cooperatively on the Nation's pressing problems.

Many people will now want to forget all about Watergate, to leave to the courts and the Special Prosecutor whatever tidying up needs to be done.

But we must not forget Watergate, as Mr. Nixon asked us to do. We still do not have all the facts pertinent to the charges of misconduct in office which all members of the House Judiciary Committee now feel represented impeachable

offenses. It is extremely important that the American people know the full story—what happened—how did it happen—who was involved—and why it happened.

I understand that many Members of this body are pressing for some action by the full House to accept and perhaps approve the Judiciary Committee's findings in the committee's report which we will have early next week. These Members hope to wrap up the question of impeachment quickly and quietly and make a record which will serve as a guide to future Presidents.

But all the questions have not been answered, and the full story of Watergate is not known. Until the full story of Richard Nixon's involvement in the Watergate coverup and abuse of Presidential powers is known, history and the American people may forever suffer an incomplete understanding of these traumatic events and the lessons they must teach.

At a minimum, the tapes that that committee has subpoenaed must be produced. The Congress must take appropriate action to assure that all pertinent Presidential records are preserved and laid open, so that the American people can know the full facts of the shame inflicted on all of us, and may through their representatives take steps to show that they reject the immorality of that shame. In addition, we should consider legislation requiring that all Presidential papers, documents, tapes, and so forth, be turned over to the National Archives so that they be made available to the Congress and the public. In this instance, the past practice of allowing departing Presidents to take their papers with them and dispose of them as they wish should not be followed.

I expect many of my colleagues will find their political instincts make them cringe at these ideas. Partisans will charge harassment and vindictiveness.

Completing the record of Watergate is no such thing.

As to the possible prosecution of Richard Nixon for the crimes he has committed, that is a matter that the Congress may properly leave to our judicial system, and more particularly to the Special Prosecutor. There is no reason why Mr. Nixon should be given immunity, any more than any of his subordinates who conspired with him.

As this page in history is turned, we may all welcome Gerald Ford to the White House. While we may expect to differ with him on many issues, it will be a welcome change to have as our President a person we can trust to uphold the Constitution and to tell the truth.

THE 1974 CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Flood) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in our country and other parts of the Free World, the 15th anniversary of Captive Nations Week was successfully observed by free citizens who raised their voices in behalf of the human and national rights of the

captive nations and peoples in Eastern Europe, within the Soviet Union, in Asia, and in Cuba.

If anything else, the singular contribution of the week has been its stress on the need for a general and incisive reevaluation of our present type of detente policy and its effects not only upon the captive nations but upon our own national security interests.

As indications of this contribution to the public forum and as further evidences of the week's success, I submit for the considered reading of our Members and our citizens the following examples of the week's events:

The proclamation of Mayor Richard J. Daley of Chicago; the editorial "Captive Nations Week" in The New York Sunday News of July 14; a perceptive editorial in the Washington Catholic Standard of July 11, titled "Perennial Reminder"; resolutions of the Chicago Captive Nations Week Committee; a Public Affairs release written by Gen. Thomas A. Lane on "Second Yalta Betrays Captive Nations"; and the "Lest We Forget" list of captive nations in the June, 1974 issue of International Digest:

[Office of the mayor city of Chicago]

PROCLAMATION

Whereas, in accordance with Congressional enactment, Captive Nations Week will be observed during the period of July 15 through July 20; and

Whereas, under auspices of the Captive Nations Friends Committee the annual parade will be held on State Street, beginning at noon Saturday, on July 20; and

Whereas, many people of nations made captive by the imperialistic policies of Communism are linked by bonds of family relationships to citizens of this community; and

Whereas, it is appropriate for all freedom-loving people to demonstrate to the populations of the captive nations support for their just aspirations for liberty and national independence; and

Whereas, it is commendable in every way that citizens of the United States, in appreciation of their constitutional guarantees of freedom should extend sympathy and hope of liberation to those whose rights have been constricted by Communist aggression:

Now, therefore, I, Richard J. Daley, Mayor of the City of Chicago, do hereby proclaim the period of July 15 through July 20, 1974, to be CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK IN CHICAGO and urge general participation in the special events arranged for this time.

Dated this 26th day of April, A. D. 1974.
Richard J. Daley, Mayor.

[From the Sunday News, July 14, 1974]

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

—is being observed, starting today, throughout the U.S. as it has been every third week in July since Congress so decreed in 1959.

At a time when our government is pursuing a policy of detente with the Communist oppressors of these enslaved peoples, Captive Nations Week may appear to some Americans an anachronism, a relic of the Cold War.

But we cannot turn our backs on those miserable, suffering millions—those "huddled masses yearning to breathe free"—without being false to all we believe, and to all for which America has stood from its founding.

In this area, the observance begins today with a 10 a.m. Mass in St. Patrick's Cathedral, followed by a march up Fifth Ave. to a rally at the Central Park Mall. We hope that citizens from the metropolitan area will turn out to swell the cry: Set these people free.

[From Catholic Standard, July 11, 1974]

PERENNIAL REMINDER

Captive Nations Week (July 14-20) is the perennial reminder of an ongoing reality. Millions of people throughout the world are still being denied the right to life in a free society. This takes on an even greater significance in the light of the present discussion of detente.

Dr. Lev. E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University, long recognized as an outstanding authority on the background and fate of those who suffer the tyranny of national captivity, has prepared a detailed indepth analysis of the subject in connection with the 15th anniversary of Captive Nations Week. In his paper entitled, "The Illusions of Detente," he points out that any effort toward detente without the dissolution of the factors which underlie these illusions "will only court disaster for us and the Free World."

At the present time, and despite the existence of the United Nations, 27 nations and groupings of people are under Communist domination. This denies to millions of people the fundamental rights guaranteed by the United Nations Charter. A number of nations have been held captive since 1920. Others became subject to this tyrannical rule subsequent to the creations of the United Nations, and as late as 1960. No nation or people once so subjected has ever regained freedom.

We recognize the enormity of the responsibility facing President Nixon and his Secretary of State, Dr. Henry Kissinger, in their dealings with the Soviet Union in the age of potential nuclear warfare. However, nothing in the reports of their recent state visit to the Soviet Union indicates any change in the basic attitude of the Soviet leaders with respect to the freedom of their people. Apparently the President did not raise the issue despite the deep concern felt by so many people in this country.

According to Dr. Dobriansky, Dr. Kissinger defines detente as "a process of managing relations with a potentially hostile country in order to preserve peace." This is nothing more than "peace at any price." It presumes, as well, the existence of conditions that in fact do not exist. Such a peace simply provides the condition for further additions to the already over-long list of captive nations. But even allowing for the possibility of success with such a pragmatic approach, Dr. Dobriansky points out that hard-nosed power plays of this type leave no room "for the moral forces of idealism, human rights, freedom, national independence, etc." It is perhaps the most absurd illusion concerning detente.

Despite our imperfections, this nation is founded on moral idealism to a degree unsurpassed in the history of man. The continuing impact of American idealism on the captive nations," says Dr. Dobriansky, "is boundless and is one of the greatest of our weapons against the Kremlin totalitarians." With this we must agree. Nor can this nation in her dealings with the "captor" nations forget even for a moment, the sad fate of the captive nations.

[Chicago Captive Nations Week Committee]

RESOLUTIONS

Whereas, in 1959 President Dwight D. Eisenhower and the Congress of the United States designated the third week in July as Captive Nations Week in order to focus world attention on the plight of those nations who have lost their national independence as the result of direct and indirect aggression of world communism; and

Whereas, the national independence of the (28) Captive Nations are: Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bulgaria, China (mainland), Cossackia, Croatia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Estonia, Latvia, Lithu-

ania, North Korea, North Viet Nam, Outer Mongolia, Poland, Rumania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Tibet, Turkestan, Ukraine, Idel-Ural and other nations suppressed by their communist masters; and

Whereas, the Soviet Union has lulled the Western Powers into a false sense of security, and while talking "detente" has reached a pinnacle of military might and soon will surpass that of the United States; and

Whereas, it is horrifying to realize that one-third of mankind is already enslaved by communist tyranny—that threatens the security of the free world, communist propaganda has been allowed to carry on its deceptive work towards the weakening of the will for defense, the United States at this critical period for the entire free world to assume the role of real leadership, able to cope with these frightening facts; and

Whereas, the government of the Soviet Union has spread their propaganda throughout the United States and the rest of the free world for the purpose of blinding the people of the West towards its genocide of non-Russian Nations under its occupation; and

Now, therefore, be it resolved; the Chicago Captive Nations Week Committee, that special efforts must be made by the United States, towards an awakening of all these moral forces, humane ideas and values, the sacred rights of all the nations based on principles of democracy, self-determination, and sovereignty within their respective ethnic boundaries, must become the goal of the policy; and

Be it further resolved; the farce of "Patronage" diplomacy, secret talks, the wining and dining, the exchanging of diplomatic gifts, with the masters of the slave empires, will not bring about the pursuit of the God-given sacred rights of freedom for all captive nations of the world, the cries for freedom can still be heard, in spite of the diplomatic festivities; and

Be it further resolved, that the United States government stop building up the communist empire by selling it military and other equipment and trade, and that the media give greater coverage to the dissidents in the Soviet Empire. The Aleksandr I. Solzhenitsyn case illustrates, the power of public opinion and the role that the media can play in eliminating individual persecution and eventually, stopping the genocide of the enslaved nations; and

Be it further resolved, that this Committee desperately urge the establishment of the permanent Captive Nations Committee (House Resolution 211) and Freedom Academy, which has been long overdue; and

Be it further resolved, that the Captive Nations Committee, request the United States government to reaffirm its support for the aims and aspirations of the people of these captive nations in behalf of the restoration of freedom and democracy in these communist dominated countries.

VIKTORS VIKSNINS,

Chairman.

ALEXANDER KOEPP,

Estonia.

DR. GEORGE RADOYEVICH,

Serbia.

DR. ROMAN KOLYLCEKY,

Ukraine.

DR. NICHOLAS FERJENCIK,

Czechoslovakia.

LI-SUNG PANG,

China.

SABIN TORLO, Jr.,

Croatia.

J. WITKOWSKI,

Poland.

NICK ZYZISNUSKI,

Belarus.

ILMARS BERGMANIS,

Latvia.

JUOZAS BELILINAS,

Lithuania.

LASZLO MOGYOROSSY,

Hungary.

WILFRIED A. KERNBACH,

Germany.

[From Public Affairs, July 14, 1974]

SECOND YALTA BETRAYS CAPTIVE NATIONS

We begin Captive Nations Week in the backwash of the Moscow Summit—a study in contrasts. The original Captive Nations Week was inaugurated in the Eisenhower Administration, when the country regarded liberation of the captive countries as the sensible object of U.S. policy. But today, these are the forgotten peoples. Detente is designed to silence their cries.

When we examine the story of our ethnic Americans, we must be impressed by their lack of political effectiveness. Combined, they represent a powerful sector of the electorate. They have a common interest in U.S. foreign policy. But they are ineffectual because they are the captives of the political parties.

Both political parties court the ethnic vote, but only with promises. At election time they seek the support of the ethnic societies with expressions of sympathy and pledges of devotion to their interests. But in the international arena, U.S. officials have repudiated their promises to the captives to win the approbation of the masters. Franklin Roosevelt and Winston Churchill promised the Four Freedoms but gave them Yalta.

The fate of the nations behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains hinges on the foreign policy of the United States. No one expects the United States to go to war to force liberation. But it seems reasonable to expect the United States and other free countries to have a continuing bias for freedom and therefore to further the liberation of the Captive Nations by all practical means. As President Nixon returns from a Second Yalta, similar in all essential respects to the first, we have the repetition of history, a sacrifice of the Captive Nations to advance the selfish interest of trade with the tyrants.

How can this be so? How can this nation so largely drawn from European nations now under the heel of communism or threatened by it court the oppressors and ignore the cries of the oppressed? Are our German, Polish, Hungarian and other ethnic societies so tied to Democratic or Republican apron strings that they accept supinely such betrayal of their true interests? Or are their leaders so witless as to be hoodwinked by the pretensions of peacemaking in which the betrayal is concealed.

Or are these ethnic Americans reluctant to press for policies in which they have a special interest? They should not be. The policy of appeasement and betrayal pursued by U.S. foreign policy for forty years has been deeply injurious to our national interests. Those Americans who by their special heritage are endowed with clear vision of the error have a civic duty to expose and oppose it with all the resources at their command.

There is no hope for the Captive Nations except in the re-direction of U.S. foreign policy. That change of course will not be taken by our business interests which are drooling over the prospect of trade with the Soviet Union and Red China. It probably will not happen short of catastrophe unless a powerful coalition of our ethnic societies severs association with both political parties and forms a separate block committed to the restoration of freedom in the communist-ruled states.

How ironic it is that the voices for restoration of civilized rule in the Captive Nations should come out of Russia itself, from the oppressed and suffering people and not from their cousins who live in freedom and comfort in the West! Does freedom undermine courage? Is it a luxury which blurs the mind and softens the will? Why else do we trifle with Watergate and ignore the agon-

izing oppression suffered by one-third of the world's people? Captive Nations Week asks us.

[From International Digest, June, 1974]

"LEST WE FORGET"—CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK
JULY 14-20

These nations have fallen under the yoke of Communist tyranny since the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917 and remain in chains today:

Year of Communist takeover

People or nation:	
Armenia	1920
Azerbaijan	1920
Byelorussia	1920
Cossackia	1920
Georgia	1920
Idel-Ural	1920
North Caucasus	1920
Ukraine	1920
Far Eastern Republic	1922
Turkestan	1922
Mongolian People's Republic	1924
Estonia	1940
Latvia	1940
Lithuania	1940
Albania	1946
Bulgaria	1946
Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, et cetera, in Yugoslavia	1946
Poland	1947
Rumania	1947
Czechoslovakia	1948
North Korea	1948
Hungary	1949
East Germany	1949
Mainland China	1949
Tibet	1951
North Vietnam	1954
Cuba	1960

A MUST AND A SUGGESTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, the temporary abatement in the drawn-out furor and upheaval that has characterized our governmental life the past few years brought about with the swearing in of Gerald R. Ford as the 38th President of the United States must not lull us into smugness and a fatal indifference to the imperative need to repeal the 25th amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

Indeed, the foremost priority must be given this task of removing a mischievous—almost pernicious—appendage to the basic law of the land.

To those who are almost ecstatic about how all that has so unhappily transpired "proves how our system does work," some volunteering to point out how there are no soldiers on the streets and no violent men intent in wresting away control of our Government, et cetera. I must remind that a lot of this has been due to luck, happenstance, and the momentum of common institutionalized life, not zealous guarding of the weal.

I must needs remind them that had the individual in the Presidency been a less antagonistic character, or a more charismatic and loved personality, we might not have fared half as well.

Yet, despite the euphoria of the moment, there hangs over our national collective heads a sword of Damocles: The 25th amendment.

Back in 1966 when the resolution proposing this amendment was entertained in the House to my astonished disbelief, I stated that this type of law reminded me of a throwback to the Roman Senate days of intrigue and conspiracy and venal and bold and ambitious men. In vain did I attempt to conjure the vision of what could happen under the aegis of this amendment in our own Republic at some future time of stress and malaise. I never dreamed the day would have come upon us so soon.

The dormant bomb that is the 25th amendment is still ticking, and Mr. Speaker, until we defuse it by repeal, we are in mortal danger. I urge my colleagues to join me in considering most seriously the repeal of this fatally defective proviso.

Now for a serious and good faith bit of advice, by way of recommendation to our former colleague, now President Gerald Ford. Mr. President, today you have appealed to the Nation for forgiveness and a spirit of contriteness and harmony. In keeping with that request, I respectfully submit that you soberly and seriously consider a Presidential pardon to John Dean, and maybe two or three others, such as E. Krogh, because had it not been for the courage of a Dean, we would never have been apprised of the malodorous practices that have enveloped high national governmental life and brought us to such low state.

Consider for a moment that the saving feature of our society is always we have had men whose conscience has finally prodded them to rise above their ambition and selfish strivings—even at the risk of obloquy—and sounded the alarm. Dean did not perjure himself either. His was an American conscience crying out its remorse. He deserves justice and compassion; he defied the mendacious tyrant. His story was proven true by the torrent of events and climaxed at the eleventh hour by the former President's admission that he, Nixon, had lied—and John Dean had told the truth.

President Ford, I respectfully and humbly submit to you just as a starter to prove the sincerity of your national plea by forgiving John Dean.

THE DEPARTURE OF PRESIDENT NIXON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOWARD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, last evening at 9:05 p.m., our President, Richard M. Nixon, announced his decision to resign from the high public office to which he had been elected less than 3 years ago. The heart of this Nation and the hearts of its people—myself included—skipped a beat as those fateful words were uttered. There was no feeling of relief or jubilation, but rather a sense of painful and perhaps stoic acceptance.

This is not the time to second guess the wisdom or propriety of his decision. It must be received as it was given—in the expectation that the action was in the best interest of the Nation. Yet, at

this early date, something very important can be gleaned from the events of the past 2 years. It is the strength of our form of government. Today, we shall have a new President, and soon we are to have a new Vice President, neither of whom has been elected to those offices through the usual electoral process. Nonetheless, they will be accepted without question. There has been no violent overthrow of power. There has been no toppling of our democratic institutions. This country's form of government and its people have withstood a serious onslaught not only by some of the actions of Mr. Nixon himself, but also, and more critically, in the last 2 years, by the very process of obtaining the truth. The strength of our Nation has been illuminated throughout the world.

Why is it that we still believe in and adhere to those words set down in the Constitution nearly two centuries ago? Perhaps that question, if answerable at all, will be considered by the historians and psychologists of the future. But there can be no doubt that in bad times as well as good it is those articles, phrases, and clauses to which we cling for guidance and structure.

It is the Constitution and through it our form of government for which we have struggled and must continue to struggle to preserve. It is an often quoted phrase that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." It must be admitted by those who now hold public office as well as by the public in general that in the recent past we have been less than vigilant in our preservation of our institutions. We have taken our system of government for granted. We have taken advantage of it, and now we all must share in the sadness of Richard Millhous Nixon. None of us are above the ramifications of what has transpired in the past 2 years. It may be too soon to say that our Constitution has withstood its greatest test, but it is certain that this peaceful transfer of power speaks highly for the ability of this Nation and its leaders to cope with the most heart-rending of problems.

Repeatedly over the past 2 years, commentators both here and abroad have wondered just how much the American people can endure. The answer now seems clear. The American people can endure all that is necessary. There is a growing suggestion that the people have become increasingly cynical of their elected officials. Regardless of the truth of that observation, their belief in the domestic form of government itself has been exposed and strengthened.

Furthermore, the work of the House Judiciary Committee in its deliberations concerning the grounds for impeachment of Mr. Nixon cannot be slighted. The willingness of those 38 men and women to pursue the facts with courage, intelligence, and dignity was transmitted to the entire Nation on nationwide television. Mr. Nixon was not driven from the White House as the result of a partisan "witch hunt." His decision to resign was executed in the midst of the appropriate constitutional process of impeachment. It was an awesome power which was not lightly included by the framers in this document. However, the greatness of that

power could not reasonably prohibit its implementation. The propriety of that proceeding has been brought out by subsequent revelations.

Less than 2 weeks ago, those Representatives cast their votes either for or against the impeachment of a President of the United States. It is fair to say that at the time, not one of them anticipated that their action would become the end and not the beginning of that constitutional process. Unknown to them, they were given the tremendous burden of defining for posterity the meaning of the "checks and balances" system that is the very heart of our democratic institutions. It was they who set at least general limitations on the power of the Presidency. It is because of them that future Presidents will be on notice of the responsibilities of their office and the ability of Congress to hold them to account for serious abuse of that office. It is through them that the nebulous term "high crimes and misdemeanors" received some clarification. It can only be said that they did their job well, and for that everyone must be grateful.

Today Gerald Ford becomes the 38th President of the United States, and today the work of the Nation and this Congress begins anew—to work together to solve the problems of the economy, the arms race, and a myriad of others. The Nation may be shaken, but it is not shattered. It need not be emphasized, for it should go without saying, that this Nation and this Congressman intend to pledge allegiance to him as President and will endeavor to cooperate with him to every extent possible, and with due respect to that office which came to him at such great cost—the price of eternal vigilance.

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF HERBERT HOOVER'S BIRTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. MEZVINSKY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MEZVINSKY. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow marks the 100th anniversary of the birth of our 31st President, Herbert Clark Hoover. West Branch, Iowa, a town near my home, will be the site of a celebration to commemorate his birth. On this occasion, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to the extent of this great humanitarian's public service.

Although Herbert Hoover is best remembered as President from 1929–1933, some of his greatest accomplishments were achieved in his non-Presidential years.

Three times he was called upon to oversee the distribution of food to starving people all over the world—after the Boxer Rebellion in China and after the First and Second World Wars in Europe. He used great skill and compassion in assuring that millions of the hungry survivors of the war-ravaged nations of the world were fed.

After Mr. Hoover had been in public service for nearly five decades, he continued to work for the public in spite of his advancing years. As Chairman of the Commission for Reorganization of the Executive Branch—1947–49—and its

successor, the Second Commission on Reorganization—1953-55—he made important contributions to the efficiency of the executive branch of the Government.

As we consider this centenary of Herbert Hoover's birth, we remember him as a great Iowan and a tirelessly dedicated public servant.

"WHY I LOVE AMERICA" PROGRAM BUILDS TRUST AND CONFIDENCE IN GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CHAPPELL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest needs in America today is to create a better thinking and working relationship between our young people of high school age and the civic and business leaders in their communities. This is especially needed today at a time when many events have shaken the very foundation of public trust and confidence upon which our political institutions have been built. Now, more than ever before, we must find ways to instill in our young people an appreciation for the ideals upon which our Nation was built and to encourage people in all segments of our communities to rededicate themselves to these ideals.

One outstanding example of how to help bring about this patriotic reawakening is the "Why I Love America" program, begun in DeLand, Fla., in my congressional district. Its objectives are to create a better thinking and working relationship between loyal, young Americans at the community level and their civic, business, church, and fraternal leaders. These objectives have been attained by: First, training high school students to speak to adult community organizations about the virtues of our free society and the free enterprise system—acknowledging the need for change but emphasizing the basic strengths of the system; second, motivating other students to write essays on the subject, "Why I Love America"; and third, motivating artistically inclined students to create inspiring and patriotic-type posters which are displayed throughout their community. The program has received a warm response from the DeLand community including civic groups, parents, and the news media.

The "Why I Love America" program was the brainchild of Barry Crim, a retired lawyer and educator, who saw the need for greater confidence in our Government and for more meaningful dialogue between high school students and community leaders. I have been privileged to work closely with Mr. Crim on this program since its beginning in 1971. It was initially sponsored by the DeLand Kiwanis Club and the DeLand Area Chamber of Commerce. Mr. Crim, a native of Georgia, wanted to provide this patriotic service to the young people and adults in his home area. He solicited the support of the Rotary Club of Warm Springs and Manchester, Ga., which sponsored the second "Why I Love America" program, which was endorsed in a

statewide proclamation by Governor Jimmy Carter.

Florida's Governor Reubin Askew has proclaimed this week of August 5-12, 1974, as "We Love America Week" in Florida as yet another endorsement in behalf of the "Why I Love America" program. In his proclamation, Governor Askew notes:

It is essential that we "light a candle, not just condemn the darkness of political immorality" by implementing a positive, patriotic program at the local government level to underscore and emphasize a rededication by each of us to the true patriotic ideals of our forefathers and to the principle upon which our political institutions are based.

"Why I Love America" is just such a patriotic program.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to give recognition here to some of the patriotic citizens who implemented and promoted the "Why I Love America" program.

From DeLand—Ralph H. Bowles, Forrest E. Breckenridge, William R. Cambron, Mrs. Sue Collier, Mrs. Elsa S. Corning, Dermott Dessert, Dr. Joseph R. Estes, James H. Ford, Ned Grimes, Caywood Gunby, Richard Heard, James R. Lawrence, Glen W. Martin, John H. McEwen, Miss Harriet Roberts, Miss Debbie Rogers, Mike Ross, Dean Smith, Robert Smith, Miss Karen Taylor, Robert B. Weaver, and Mrs. Evelyn West. From nearby communities—Ed Dunn and Kiwanis Lt. Gov. Paul Shuler of Daytona Beach; Judge Douglas Stenstrom of Sanford; Col. Mace Harris, Orange City; Roy M. Foster, Lake Helen; and Past Kiwanis Governor Russell Cole of Orlando. From Georgia—Marvin Enquist and Jim Cole of Warm Springs and James Evans and Cecil Hamby of Manchester. I commend each of these individuals for their support of the "Why I Love America" program.

Mr. Speaker, there is a need for this program in every community in America. I have watched the tremendous response in DeLand to the student speakers, the essay and poster contests, and the feeling of patriotism and loyalty which swells within the community as the goals and dreams of America are communicated through art and the spoken and written word of our great young people. I commend the "Why I Love America" program to communities throughout America. Further information may be obtained from Mr. Barry Crim, 434 North Colorado Avenue, DeLand, Fla. 32720.

I request that a copy of Governor Askew's proclamation be inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas, the recent revelations of public corruption and immorality at all levels of government have seriously eroded the confidence of the American people in the political leaders of our Nation, and

Whereas, these revelations have shaken the very foundation of public trust upon which our political institutions have been built, and

Whereas, there is no more noble nor necessary goal than to work to immediately restore the confidence and trust of the American people in our political institutions and leaders, and

Whereas, it is essential that we "light a candle, not just condemn the darkness of political immorality," by implementing a

positive, patriotic program at the local government level to underscore and emphasize a rededication by each of us to the true patriotic ideals of our forefathers and to the principle upon which our political institutions are based, and

Whereas, the DeLand Area Chamber of Commerce, the DeLand Chapter of the American Association of Retired Persons, and the Patriotic Education, Inc., organizations are sponsoring an oratorical presentation for all high school and college age students in the Greater DeLand Area with the theme, "Why I Love America," and

Whereas, the week beginning August 5-12, 1974, will be observed by these organizations and other interested citizens as a time to emphasize true patriotism to our Nation;

Now, therefore, I, Reuben O'D. Askew, by virtue of the authority vested in me as Governor of the State of Florida, do hereby proclaim the period of August 5-12, 1974, as We Love America Week in Florida, and urge all of our citizens to join together in allegiance to our Nation and to the precepts upon which our political institutions and system were founded.

A REAFFIRMATION OF FAITH IN OUR POLITICAL SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I think this is an appropriate time for me to express some thoughts on the events of the last 24 hours.

We can all be gratified that the President last night made probably the most statesmanlike speech in his entire career. He did not choose to divide us. Rather he tried to unite us.

I think we can also be proud that he chose to emphasize the tremendous achievements of his own administration and the lofty goals which he aspired to and, I assume, still does.

It is tragic indeed that a nation has to come to the point where its Chief Executive is forced by public opinion and by, as he put it, the loss of support in Congress, to resign before the end of his term. Yet I think this would not have occurred had the President not failed to realize that it is not alone high ideals and high goals and high ends that a President or a political leader must have, but he must also be scrupulous about the means which he employs to achieve his ends. The tragedy of Richard Nixon is that his choice of means did not always equal his high ends. That is a lesson for all of us in political life and, of course, life in general.

It was also gratifying today to hear our new President, Gerald Ford, in his inspiring and straight-from-the-shoulder inaugural speech to the country. We can be proud of that speech. I sent him a telegram expressing my pride and my support for his efforts to lead us to peace, to solve the Nation's problems, to bring us together again, and to restore the faith of the people in our political system.

Mr. Speaker, our political system has proved that it is strong. The events of the last weeks and hours have been a triumph for our Constitution and for the genius of our Founding Fathers, who foresaw the need for constitutional provisions to meet the very kind of situa-

tion which we have faced during the last few months. Because the Founding Fathers understood history and human nature, the concepts they created still work.

But they also work because a great many people in the Committee on the Judiciary and in the Congress have been dedicated to making them work and have been faithful to the pledge, in their oath of office, to preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States.

I have heard many comments by Members of this body and by people in my district and elsewhere that the proceedings of the Committee on the Judiciary restored the faith of the people in the House of Representatives and in the Congress. I am gratified to have been a part of those proceedings. If we did help restore the people's faith in our institutions, it is because the members of that committee as a whole showed their dedication to the Constitution and to the laws of the country and to their duty, as Members of Congress and regardless of party affiliation, to uphold the law, follow the truth wherever it may lead, and let the chips fall where they may.

We can be gratified that we have had a reaffirmation by the people and the Congress of the concept that no man is above the law.

Finally, I think we can be gratified in the character of the leadership we have had in our committee. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO), the chairman of the committee, has received universal acclaim for his fairness, his courage, his wisdom, and his patience.

I do not think anyone can quarrel with his leadership of our committee, his selection of an outstanding professional staff, and the fairness and courtesy with which he has treated all Members.

If there were to be a monument to the 93d Congress, it should be in the work of the Committee on the Judiciary, under the chairmanship of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO) which has renewed our self respect and the faith of the people in our institution.

AMERICAN CAUSE

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, editorial comments in major newspapers reveal significant interest in a new organization which is known as American Cause. It is essentially composed of those who seek to encourage confidence in American and who wish to stress the positive side of our great country, in contrast to the barrage of negative charges which has caused concern and even despair in so many areas.

Two editorials which have been brought to my attention are of particular interest. They are from the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner of July 4, and the Washington Star-News of July 17. I submit them for reprinting in the RECORD:

[From the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner, July 4, 1974]

FOURTH OF JULY—REBIRTH OF PATRIOTISM

America's 198th birthday is an appropriate occasion for the birth of an organization sworn to defend the U.S.A. from those committed to destroying this nation.

Under the guidance of former Sen. George L. Murphy, a bipartisan organization was conceived and developed that is dedicated to the preservation of traditional American values and restoring and protecting the basic elements of our political philosophy.

Headquartered in Washington, D.C., the newly-born organization, will be known as American Cause. It will accomplish its goal of countering the widely-disseminated negative elements about this society through coordinating the efforts of organizations that believe in the basic American philosophy.

At this period in our history, when it's too often considered "profound" or "fashionable" to downgrade the greatness of America, the commitment of an organization to lend its efforts in America's behalf cannot be too highly praised.

Through a bipartisan, congressional advisory committee, American Cause intends to be guided on programs which require public attention. It intends to supply necessary research, speech writers, expert consultants in all fields, credible witnesses before congressional committees, and other means to neutralize the constant barrage of negative charges that is causing a national despair.

Because American Cause believes that some self-appointed liberal "intellectuals," leftist writers, and some members of the press and media are steadily—if not purposely—misleading and confusing the American people, it has pledged to counter this unhealthy situation.

George Murphy and his advisory committee deserve praise and support. Citizens interested in contacting American Cause may reach it by writing to its headquarters, at 905 Sixteenth Street, N.W.; Suite 304; Washington, DC 20006.

[From the Washington Star-News, July 17, 1974]

MURPHY'S "AMERICAN CAUSE"

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

George Murphy called a press conference the other day, but almost nobody came. This was a pity, because the former California senator is a good man, and he was engaged in launching a worthy venture.

The old hoover's purpose was to announce the formation of "American Cause." Though he wouldn't say so directly, American Cause obviously is intended to function as a conservative counter-force to the liberals' Common Cause. It is a consummation, as a certain Scandinavian used to say, devoutly to be wished.

Under the leadership of John Gardner, Common Cause has become one of the best-heeled and most effective lobbies in town. There was a time when Americans for Democratic Action served as front-runner for liberal propositions. When ADA ran out of wind, Common Cause picked up the torch. Now Common Cause is hustling from here to California on everything from consumer protection to the federal financing of elections.

If I voice admiration, I voice envy also. I wish Gardner's outfit were on our side. Respectable American conservatism could use 330,000 contributors pitching in \$6 million a year. Our side has nothing like that.

If you listen for the voice of American conservatism, you will hear the urbane accents of National Review and the homespun strictures of Human Events. You will hear a few columnists and a few newspapers, notably the Wall Street Journal, but in terms of

organizational voices, you will hear very little.

Barry Goldwater's fledgling Free Society Association crashed before it ever flew. Americans for Constitutional Action is inactive. The American Conservative Union has done some first-rate things—its attack on the President's Family Assistance Plan was a masterful job—but ACU has become so identified with Ronald Reagan that it lacks a broad base.

Out on the extreme edges of right field are Liberty Lobby and the John Birch Society, whose suicidal practice is to drown their sensible positions in great baths of hogwash. That's about it.

Will Murphy's American Cause get off the ground? It hurts to say this, but I doubt it.

Conservatives are a funny breed. Politically and ideologically, they are loners. They tend to peer through their microscopes darkly, seeing one issue at a time: gun control, right to work, fluoridation, racial balance busing, arms limitation, pornography.

Thus blinkered, they cannot be distracted by issues on either side. I once knew a rich Southern gentleman, now dead, who proposed to put up \$50,000 to found a conservative organization. There was this hitch: The organization's sole purpose would be to prove that the 14th Amendment never had been ratified.

In launching American Cause, Murphy is tackling this natural perversity of the American right. Liberals have no such problem. They have a splendid motto: United we stand. Ours is different: Divided we fall.

Once Murphy moves beyond the patty-cake issues and plunges into areas of passionate disagreement, he is likely to shatter his constituency before he ever gets it glued together.

Yet the effort is worth a try. Murphy's prospectus rings all the old nostalgic chimes. American Cause would promote "a firm belief in the Constitution, free speech, free practice of religious worship, a responsible and trusted free press, the free enterprise system, the profit incentive, the right of private ownership of property, the maintenance of peace and safety in our communities, and the guarantee of national security from all enemies."

These are admirable goals, broadly appealing, but they are fuzzy around the edges. If American Cause is to compete with Common Cause in the arena of ideas, it will have to sharpen its aim and focus on specific targets.

The unavoidable risk is that some of Murphy's conservative prima donnas, offended at the neglect of their solo projects, will then stalk off the stage and go home.

ONE HUNDRED AND EIGHT SPONSORS OF RESOLUTION URGING WITHDRAWAL OF FOREIGN TROOPS FROM CYPRUS

(Mr. BRADEMAS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, on August 2, 1974, on behalf of the gentleman from Maine (Mr. KYROS), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. YATRON), the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BAFALIS), and myself and a number of other Members of the House, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 577 and a companion resolution calling for the immediate withdrawal of all foreign troops from the Republic of Cyprus and the restoration of peace by the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, I shall on Monday next introduce another resolution, identical to House Concurrent Resolution 577, with additional cosponsors.

This further resolution now brings the total number of cosponsors of House Concurrent Resolution 577 to 108 Members of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, the need for the passage of this resolution is eloquently summarized in the following editorial, of August 8, 1974, from the Washington Star-News, and I ask unanimous consent to insert this editorial at this point in the RECORD.

SLIPPERY TRUCE

The persistent violations of the Cyprus cease-fire agreement are a disheartening commentary on the readiness of the antagonists to reach an early and durable settlement on the island's status. The gunfire, the military maneuvering and the continued endangerment of isolated groups of civilians provide a poor climate for the second round of Geneva talks aimed at ending the crisis.

The aggressiveness of Turkish forces, in enlarging the wedge of territory they control between the outskirts of Nicosia and the north coast around Kyrenia, has presented the most blatant threat to the truce. Greek Cypriot forces have dragged their feet on the cease-fire requirement that they evacuate Turkish Cypriot enclaves elsewhere on the island. They surround and have made hostages of some Turkish communities, and hold thousands of Turkish Cypriot prisoners. Lightly-armed United Nations troops, assigned the thankless job of preventing clashes between Greeks and Turks, have been pushed around unconscionably by both sides, suffering more than a score of casualties in the process.

The solidification of the July 30 cease-fire should be the first task of the diplomats in Geneva. Then the longer-range questions of Cyprus' future can be given proper attention.

Turkey in particular should be made to see the wisdom of quitting while it is ahead. Its successful invasion has enormously enhanced the Turkish Cypriot bargaining position. A reckless military government in Athens, after sponsoring the disastrous coup that overthrew Cypriot President Makarios, has been replaced by a moderate civilian model anxious for a settlement of the long-festering Cyprus question. The Turkish demand for a federation of semi-autonomous Greek and Turkish cantons on the island, with the Turkish minority enjoying possibly an equal say in joint affairs, has a good chance of carrying the day. But if Ankara overplays its hand it could undercut and even bring down the new Athens regime, revive the possibility of direct warfare between Greece and Turkey and delay indefinitely a peaceful solution for Cyprus.

The United States is not an official participant in the negotiations about Cyprus, which immediately involve Greece, Turkey, and Britain as the 1960 guarantors of Cypriot independence, joined by representatives of the new Clerides government in Nicosia. But Washington's considerable influence with Greece and Turkey should be used to close out the prospect of renewed hostilities between the NATO allies and their adherents.

Mr. Speaker, I invite other Members of the House who may not already have done so to join in cosponsoring House Concurrent Resolution 577, the text of which follows:

Whereas a settlement of the present conflict in the Republic of Cyprus is vital to the peace and security of the eastern Mediterranean and is in the best interests of world peace and stability; and

Whereas a settlement depends upon the right of the Cypriot people to determine their own destiny and the efforts of the United Nations to act as a negotiating body; and

Whereas Resolution 2077(xx) adopted by the General Assembly on December 18, 1965, "calls upon all states . . . to respect the sovereignty, unity, independence, and territorial integrity of the Republic of Cyprus and to refrain from any intervention directed against it"; and

Whereas the continued presence of foreign troops in Cyprus undermines the ability of the Cypriot people to resolve their own crisis and the efforts of the United Nations to restore peace; and

Whereas Resolution 353 adopted by the Security Council on July 20, 1974, "demands an immediate end to foreign military intervention in the Republic of Cyprus" and "requests the withdrawal without delay from the Republic of Cyprus of foreign military personnel present otherwise than under the authority of international agreements. . ."; and

Whereas the declaration on Cyprus signed by the foreign ministers of Britain, Turkey, and Greece, in Geneva on July 30, 1974, calls for a "timely and phased reduction of the number of armed forces" from Cypriot soil; and

Whereas the continued presence of foreign troops in Cyprus violates international agreements and United Nations resolutions, threatens the independence and territorial integrity of the island, jeopardizes peace and stability in the eastern Mediterranean, and imperils the very existence of NATO: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That all foreign troops currently involved in Cyprus be withdrawn immediately so that the United Nations may be permitted to restore peace to the island and the Cypriot people guaranteed the right to determine their own destiny.

Mr. Speaker, I list at this point in the RECORD the cosponsors of the resolution urging withdrawal of foreign troops from Cyprus:

Mr. Brademas, Mr. Kyros, Mr. Yatron, Mr. Sarbanes, Mr. Bafalis, Mr. Wolff, Mr. Annunzio, Mr. Van Deerlin, Mr. McFall, Mr. Burke of Massachusetts, Mr. Waggoner, Mr. Koch, Mr. Breaux, Mr. Lott, Mr. Ginn, Mr. Clark, Mrs. Boggs, Mr. Edwards of California, Mr. Johnson of California, Mr. Smith of Iowa, Mr. Foley, Miss Jordan.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson of California, Mr. Price of Illinois, Mr. Dulski, Mr. Tiernan, Mr. Charles Wilson of Texas, Mr. Boland, Mrs. Schroeder, Mr. Hechler of West Virginia, Mr. Steed, Mr. Downing, Mr. Macdonald, Mr. John L. Burton, Mr. Howard, Mr. Helstoski, Mr. Cohen, Mr. Moss, Mr. Obey, Mr. Yates, Mr. Ryan, Mr. Hawkins, Mr. Phillip Burton, Mr. Pepper, Mr. Drinan, Mr. Danielson, Mr. Patten, Mr. Gaimo, Mr. Reuss, Mr. Murphy of Illinois, Mr. Mazzoli, Mr. Mezvinsky, Mr. Long, Mr. McKay.

Mr. Steelman, Mr. Maraziti, Mr. Moorhead of California, Mr. O'Neill, Mr. Minish, Mr. Rinaldo, Mr. Ketchum, Mr. Hanrahan, Mr. Sarasin, Mr. Conte, Mr. Johnson of Colorado, Mr. McCormack, Ms. Abzug, Mr. Moakley, Mr. Rodino, Mr. Dickinson, Mr. Frey, Mr. O'Brien, Mr. Gilman, Mr. Steele, Mr. Treen, Mr. Huber, Mr. Morgan, Mr. Adams, Mr. Fraser, Mr. Zablocki, Mr. Preyer, Mr. Hicks, Mr. Anderson of California.

Mr. Podell, Mr. Brown of California, Mr. Roe, Mr. Whitehurst, Mr. Addabbo, Mr. Nix, Mr. Anderson of Illinois, Mr. Fascell, Mr. Hinshaw, Mr. King, Mr. Grasso, Mr. Young of Georgia, Mr. Seiberling, Mr. Rees, Mr. Carney, Mr. Rosenthal, Mr. Mollohan, Mr. Fish, Mr. Moakley, Mr. Moorhead of Pennsylvania, Mr.

Studds, Mr. Harrington, Mr. Gude, Mr. Stark, Mr. Ellberg.

TIME TO BIND UP THE WOUNDS

(Mr. MILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, with the resignation this morning of Richard Nixon as the 37th President of the United States an extremely difficult period in American history has hopefully come to an end. I am sure that Mr. Nixon did what he felt was in the best interests of the Nation. Nevertheless, the whole ordeal has been a shattering experience to him and his family, to the Congress, and to the entire country. I have known Richard Nixon for a long time and was a supporter of his legislative policies. It is deeply regrettable that this sordid, tragic Watergate matter should compromise his otherwise brilliant career in the public service for a quarter of a century. However, I am confident that history will record his bold initiatives and masterful pursuit of world peace and stability.

As Gerald Ford assumes the Presidency it is time to bind up the wounds of the past 2 years so that our new President can provide the leadership that will unite the country. We must now look to the great problems that face America and which have been too often overlooked by the Government during the controversy of the past 2 years. Foremost among these critical issues is the state of the economy and in particular the rapid inflation that has attacked each citizen's pocketbook. This problem can only be successfully confronted by the full cooperation of the President and the Congress.

I had the pleasure of serving in the House of Representatives when Gerald Ford was the minority leader. I can speak first hand of his abilities and dedication to serving this country. With his many friendships here on Capitol Hill and his knowledge of the workings of the Congress, Gerald Ford will, I am confident, be able to bridge the gap between the executive and legislative branches to insure coordinated efforts in resolving the Nation's problems. I take this opportunity to pledge my full support and cooperation to President Ford as he assumes his new and awesome responsibilities. I hope that all Americans, regardless of their political beliefs, will unite behind our new President and lay to rest any bitterness that remains over the tragic events of recent months.

THE AMERICAN ECONOMY

(Mr. HANLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have been discussing the status of the American economy in recent radio broadcasts, and I thought that some of my colleagues might like to read my observations.

All of us are painfully aware of the

responsibility we bear to participate in those decisions which will set this country back on an economic course.

The scripts of the three broadcasts follow:

RADIO BROADCAST FOR WEEK OF JULY 22, 1974
Ladies and gentlemen, this is Congressman Jim Hanley speaking to you from our Nation's Capitol.

Recently, Dr. Herbert Stein, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, blamed the public for the current rate of inflation, claiming the taxpayers were reluctant to have a tax increase. I have never heard such nonsense before. This is only one more indication of the Administration's unwillingness to do anything substantive in curbing inflation, or in helping those who are hurt the most by inflation. Inflation is our Number One Problem, and it is a complex problem with no single institution to blame.

This is the first of three talks I will give on the economy. I am devoting this time to explaining why we are experiencing double digit inflation. I will not do the explanation justice, for it is too complex for even an hour lecture, but I do hope to convey the challenge we face.

A study of our present situation best begins with the Economic Stabilization Program put together by the Nixon Administration. The Wage-Price Controls they belatedly implemented were just beginning to work when the Administration decided the situation justified price increases, but not wage increases; thus the demise of Phase II. It was only natural, once given the chance, that the working man attempt to regain his rightful share of the economic pie. This by itself would not have been bad because the U.S. had a strong economy.

It was at this point that for the first time in history the whole world saw the opportunity for economic expansion. Usually, while some countries are experiencing growth, others are experiencing little or no growth. Since late 1972, all countries have been attempting to increase their share of world consumption, without a corresponding increase in production facilities. At the same time, food production did not fulfill expectations as growing conditions deteriorated in certain major agricultural regions of the world. One example of the unforeseen events was the unexplained disappearance of anchovies from the coast of South America in early 1973.

As it turned out, the best substitute for anchovies is soy beans. This led to an increase in the demand for soy beans, and the price of anything containing soy beans went up. I could go on and on, but the basic idea is that our economy has become so complex that many goods which seem to be unrelated are actually close substitutes, or use materials also used in the production of many far ranging commodities. When a shortage occurs in one area, it can affect many areas.

There are still other elements to inflation. The devaluation of the dollar caused a one time increase in the price of all imports. The increase in the cost of energy was extremely large, and has yet to make itself felt throughout the economy. These are price increases which we can do little about. They are simply decreases in all America's standard-of-living relative to the rest of the world.

One of the basic elements of all inflations, and this one is no exception, is that the government has increased the money supply at too fast a rate. This is a result of both fiscal and monetary policies, which have been attempting to improve the quality of life in the U.S. in the short run, while not examining the long run economic implications. Let me explain this point. An economy tends toward equilibrium. Whenever it is at a point away from equilibrium, it tends to correct itself. Thus, anytime there is more money cir-

culating than goods and services cost, the price of these goods and services is bid up. The long run effect of government policies designed to reduce some of our society's inherent inequities has been to cause the money supply to become too large.

The last reason for our high rate of inflation, and the most difficult to deal with, is the fact that inflation snowballs. People begin to expect inflation, and attempt to protect themselves from it; some being better able to protect themselves than others. It is for this reason that inflation must be curbed.

That is the problem. I will discuss solutions next time.

RADIO BROADCAST FOR WEEK OF JULY 29, 1974
Ladies and gentlemen, this is Congressman Jim Hanley speaking to you from our Nation's Capitol.

Curbing inflation is a most difficult process, especially if the policy is to be equitable. Any policy enacted must spread the cost of curbing inflation across the entire populace, and it must insure that the economy maintains its vitality.

After inflation, our most serious economic problem is that we need to renovate much of our capital investment. Certain industries simply do not have the capacity to produce the quantities demanded by consumers. In addition to insufficient capacity, a large proportion of our existing capital investment is old and needs replacement. Congress compensates industry for the cost of replacing old equipment through capital depreciation allowances, and without a doubt, some corporations have been negligent in their planning for such purchases. But the need for more capital expenditures is still there and must be met if we are to maintain a strong economy. Thus, corporations are scrambling for funds to invest and are helping to drive higher interest rates, which were already high, to compensate for inflation.

The result of this has been to throw the housing industry into total chaos. The housing industry is totally dependent on the ability of prospective home owners to acquire mortgages. These mortgages can be given only if savings banks, loan associations, and other thrift institutions have available adequate funds to award loans at interest rates the consumer can afford.

Right now, these institutions which form the backbone of our housing industry are seeing their deposits withdrawn in large quantities as large commercial banks, through their holding corporations, offer higher interest rates to attract funds, which they then loan out to large corporations. This is a most serious threat to our financial system, because our traditional means of financing home ownership faces total collapse if the trend is not reversed.

It is up to the Federal Reserve to hold down the rate of growth of the money supply, but at the same time to use more selective methods of credit and interest rate policy to reduce the great inequities in the current availability of credit. The economy is going to have to go through a period of sluggish economic growth while we curb inflation, and it is the Government's obligation to see that no area of the economy loses complete access to credit. Congress must look at ways to stimulate certain sectors of the economy, while restraining other sectors.

This brings to mind a problem. We need expanded production facilities. Corporations can use either retained earnings or borrowed money to finance their expansions. Presently many are borrowing, and disintermediation is occurring to accommodate their demand, with devastating effects on housing. This would not be occurring if firms were using retained earnings.

Congress is being urged by some to raise corporate income taxes. This assumes that corporations are receiving profits greater

than a reasonable return. If this were true, why aren't these firms using retained earnings, on which they pay no interest, for investment purposes. We do not have this information, and it is one more indication of the fact that the Government does not have adequate statistics on long-range economic conditions, something we need very badly.

It is in this light that the House Committee on Banking and Currency of which I am a member, has been holding hearings on monetary policy, interest rates, and inflation. We have heard testimony from economists, Federal Reserve Bank Presidents, and Dr. Arthur Burns, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve.

As you might imagine, these men hold differing opinions on the exact course monetary policy should proceed, but all agree that such policy should be made with more of an eye to long-run implications.

It is my hope that by holding these hearings, the Committee will be able to bring about a dialogue that is currently lacking in the determination of monetary policy. Doctor Burns is solely responsible for our monetary policy, and while he is a very capable person to have in charge of the Federal Reserve, he is not infallible as is proven by past performances.

It is up to Congress to give the Federal Reserve Board more guidance in policy parameters, since the FED has had a tendency to refrain from anything other than traditional means of managing the monetary aspects of the economy. If the Congress can come up with a better means of managing monetary policy, inflation will be easier to deal with, and all Americans will be better off.

RADIO BROADCAST FOR WEEK OF AUGUST 5, 1974

Ladies and gentlemen, this is Congressman Jim Hanley speaking to you from our Nation's Capitol.

This is the last of my three talks on the economy. I have already discussed the reasons we have double digit inflation and what direction monetary policy should go if we are to achieve a period of economic growth with stable prices. I would now like to outline other changes needed to fight inflation.

First, let me say that economic policy should be determined by the Executive Branch. It is much easier for the Administration to submit one proposal to Congress than it is for the many Members of the House and Senate, with their divergent philosophies, to formulate and agree on a policy. In April, I proposed a resolution calling for the Administration to bring forth a comprehensive policy for dealing with inflation, and Congress has not acted on it. The speech that Mr. Nixon gave on the economy a few weeks ago went in the right direction, but there was nothing substantive. We are in the midst of a situation that threatens to blossom into crisis proportions if action isn't taken soon and, unfortunately, the Administration is giving the problem only lip service. If the Executive Branch refuses to accept its responsibility, then the obligation is passed to the Congress, and we will have to attempt to bring together the many factions.

I was encouraged by the responses to my questionnaire regarding the economy. They showed that you, the citizens, are aware and in agreement that a whole series of coordinated actions are needed to reverse the present inflation-recession economy. Now the problem is to determine which actions should be implemented.

Last week, I discussed the need for monetary restraint and associated policies to cushion the credit situation. Monetary restraint alone cannot cure our economic ills; in fact, alone, it will probably make them worse. The most effective anti-inflation device is a surplus budget. Most projections for our current fiscal year say we will have

another deficit. The best we can probably hope for is a balanced budget.

Some would charge that the Congress is being fiscally irresponsible. Government policy is not made in an economic and social vacuum. Most budget allocations, especially the non-defense appropriations, are there for a good reason. Those who wish to cut the budget in one area will be opposed by others who cannot justify that particular cut, and vice versa. If the budget is going to be cut, it is up to the Administration to come forth with the proposals to decrease appropriations. A tax increase would decrease the inflationary influences of the budget, but we will not see an increase in taxes in 1974. Presently, a tax reform bill is pending before the House Ways and Means Committee. Its main purpose is to close loopholes which allow some to pay little or no tax, when their income is in the tens of thousands of dollars. The bill would also give middle- and lower-income families the tax break they deserve. I will do all that I can to see that this bill does not get lost in any preoccupation Congress might have with the impeachment process.

One of the Government's shortfalls is that all too often it does not look far enough into the future when making decisions. The Budget Reform Act of 1974 gives Congress, for the first time, the ability to analyze the entire budget in relation to the future.

It is my personal view that besides effective anti-inflationary monetary and fiscal policies, we need to devote special attention to the areas of food and energy. Congress is presently considering many energy proposals, but the Government has no long-range policies dealing with food production. That is the primary reason we have seen the market fluctuations become so unpredictable. Without a comprehensive policy to guide him, each producer does what appears to be in his best interest, and an erratic supply is the result. The Department of Agriculture should begin to fulfill its function of maintaining consistent market conditions for food commodities. That is one reason why Congress appropriates funds for the Agriculture Department, and I tire of their inactivity in this respect. It is but another indication of the lack of policy on the Administration's part.

The U.S. has the capability to pull itself out of its economic woes, but it cannot do so without leadership and a comprehensive policy. Although I wish Congress could go it alone, given the gravity of our situation, it cannot do so effectively. I am and will continue to urge the adoption of my resolution calling for the Administration to begin to deal seriously with the problems of the economy.

PRESIDENT FORD NEEDS TO TAKE A HARD LOOK AT THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, there are indications that the new President, Gerald Ford, plans to put emphasis on the economic troubles which beset the Nation.

If this is correct, I welcome this development and I sincerely hope that the new President will carry out his responsibility over the activities of the Federal Reserve Board. The Federal Reserve, through misguided monetary policies, has been the engine of much of our current inflation and no new economic program will succeed unless the President

is willing to make the Federal Reserve perform in the public interest.

The Federal Reserve's policy of using high excessive exorbitant and usurious interest rates as a means of fighting inflation has been a failure. It has obviously not stopped inflation but has resulted in tragic burdens for the plain people of the Nation and has bankrupted small businessmen and has contributed to a wide range of price increases.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that President Ford will take a hard look at how the Federal Reserve finances its operations. As this House well knows, the Federal Reserve uses the interest payments on the huge portfolio of paid-up bonds which reside in the New York Federal Reserve Bank. These interest payments currently run well in excess of \$4 billion annually and the Federal Reserve is free to finance its far-flung operations out of this fund without audits and without coming to the Congress for appropriations.

The bond portfolio has now grown to more than \$80 billion—something approaching 20 percent of the total national debt. These are bonds that have been paid for with the credit of the U.S. Government and they should be retired and subtracted from the national debt.

If these bonds were retired and removed as an interest-bearing debt obligation of the Federal Government, the Federal Reserve System would be required to come to Congress for appropriations like all other Government agencies. This appropriations process would be an important review of the Federal Reserve's activities and would give the Congress an opportunity to make the system more responsive to the needs of the country.

President Ford begins anew and this is a great opportunity to set the monetary house in order in all respects. As a new Chief Executive it would be highly beneficial for President Ford to call for a full-scale, top-to-bottom audit by the General Accounting Office of the Federal Reserve System. This would allow him to begin with a clean slate in the monetary area.

Mr. Speaker, while we are talking about audits, I would also like to call the President's attention to the fact that the Congress has just passed authority for Americans to own and trade gold. This reverses a policy of 40 years and the recent discussions of the gold question have raised lots of new issues. There is in some quarters confusion about how the Federal Government maintains its supply of gold and rumors about various aspects of this question continue to grow.

Therefore, I think it would be wise for some type of broad audit to be conducted of gold supplies owned and controlled by the U.S. Government. Such an audit, if conducted by the General Accounting Office, would do much to allay fears and put an end to rumors about the gold supplies. I hope President Ford will support and insist upon such an inspection by the General Accounting Office.

Mr. Speaker, the President should also consider the immediate implementation of Public Law 91-151—the Credit Control Act of 1969. This law, if triggered by

the President, would give the Federal Reserve the authority to control all aspects of credit including interest rates, maturities and downpayments.

Through the use of this law, credit could be allocated to the areas of greatest need—those areas starved for loan funds such as housing and small business. At the same time the Federal Reserve could use these powers to move credit away from inflationary areas and speculative undertakings.

On Thursday, 21 members of the Banking and Currency Committee—a majority—cosponsored a concurrent resolution calling on the President to use these powers and I hope that President Ford will take a hard look at this approach.

President Ford has indicated a desire to reconcile differences in the Nation and to gain the confidence of the people and I can think of no better way than to produce a consistent and clear plan to bring the Nation out of its current economic mess. And certainly a prime part of this plan must be a reduction in interest rates and an allocation of credit to the sagging areas of the economy.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that members of the Banking and Currency Committee will want to consider any new economic plans that President Ford may have. Much time has already been lost in dealing with economic problems and it is essential that we move forward in a meaningful fashion.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 15264

(Mr. ICHORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to advise the House that there is a provision in section 6 of the bill H.R. 15264—amending the Export Administration Act of 1969—which, if enacted in its present form, may have the effect of voiding or nullifying the action of the House and the Senate in the enactment only this July 30 of a related measure, H.R. 15492, the military procurement authorization for 1975, which the President approved this week and is now designated as Public Law 93-365. The Congress wrote into Public Law 93-365, section 709, provisions which would assure its control over and provide effective oversight with respect to the export of goods and technology which would significantly increase the present or potential military capability of identified Communist countries.

Section 709 of the act requires that applications for the export of goods, technology, or industrial techniques to the named Communist countries must be submitted to the Secretary of Defense for review prior to final authorization of such export. If the Secretary of Defense determines that any requests for such export of goods or technology will significantly increase the present or potential military capability of such Communist country, he shall recommend that the President disapprove the application. If the President disagrees with

the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense, the President is then required to submit his decision to the Congress. If the Congress within a period of 60 days of continuous session thereafter has not by concurrent resolution disapproved the application, only then may such goods or technology be eligible for export.

Now it is to be emphasized that this congressional control reserved in the Military Procurement Act can be effectively exercised only with respect to goods or technology for which a license or other authority is required. On the other hand, the bill now under consideration, H.R. 15264, contains provisions in section 6 thereof—lines 24, page 9, through line 6, page 10—which would as a practical matter nullify the reservation in the Military Procurement Act. H.R. 15264 would amend the Export Administration Act of 1969 so as not to require an authority, license, or permission to export goods, technology, or information, except to the extent that may be required in the implementation of section 3(2) of the Export Administration Act itself—section 2402(2) of title 50, appendix United States Code. While there is some broad reference to "national security" in this section of the Export Administration Act, it does not appear to me to be clear that there will be preserved a requirement for the maintenance of a licensing system for the implementation of the express policies contained in the provisions of section 709 of the Military Procurement Act—Public Law 93-365—as H.R. 15264 now reads.

In view of the fact that the present bill, H.R. 15264, was reported on June 19, 1974, prior to the enactment of the Military Procurement Act, the omission of a saving reference to Public Law 93-365 is understandable. I, therefore, advise the House that I will offer an amendment to the provisions of section 6 of H.R. 15264 by inserting immediately after the word "act" in line 5, page 10, the words "and section 709 of Public Law 93-365." I would hope that the managers of the bill will accept this amendment as I am sure they do not intend to repeal section 709 of Public Law 93-365.

CHILD CARE—WHO NEEDS IT?

(Mr. MEEDS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, the Select Education Subcommittee is currently holding hearings on the Child and Family Services Act of 1974. This legislation seeks to improve the quality and quantity of services available to young children and families with a working mother.

Yesterday's Washington Post carried a summary of recent findings by the Census Bureau indicating that the number of families headed by women has increased by nearly 50 percent since 1960. The median income for this group is only one-half the national average, with nearly 40 percent living under the poverty level.

For the women heading these families, the choice is between work outside the

home and living on a welfare check. For those who choose to work, adequate child care is spotty, frequently unavailable, and expensive if it is high quality.

I believe the statistics cited in the following article underline the need to make supportive services available to families who both need and want them:

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 8, 1974]

MORE WOMEN RUN FAMILIES

(By Peter Millus)

The number of families headed by women in the United States increased by more than a million in the last three years—as much as in the preceding 10, the Census Bureau said yesterday.

The bureau, in the first full report it has published on this problem-ridden and growing population subgroup, said one-tenth of all Americans now live in female-headed families, almost one-seventh of all children under 18 and almost one-third of all blacks in the country.

Nearly 40 percent of these 21.3 million people are poor as the government defines poverty—and these people make up fully a third of all poor people in the country. They account for more than half of the black poor. Black and white together, they are probably the largest identifiable group of poor people in the nation.

There were 4.5 million families in the country headed by women in 1960, 5.6 million in 1970. The bureau said there were 6.6 million in 1973, 12 per cent of all families 10 per cent of all white families and 35 per cent of black.

"This very rapid increase over the last several years," the bureau said, "has fostered a growing concern among social scientists and government planners regarding changes in family structure and composition."

"Much has been written, usually speculative in nature, about the general breakdown of family living arrangements in the United States. Theories range from the position that a basic transformation . . . is occurring to the position that recent changes are only momentary and the structure of the nuclear family, as we now know it, will be maintained."

The bureau offered various possible explanations for these changes. "High rates of marital dissolution through divorce and separation certainly have had an impact," it said.

"But there has also been an increase in the number of female heads of families who are single, which may be due in part to the retention of illegitimate children by their mothers and also to the liberalization of adoption procedures whereby single persons may now adopt children."

"Another important factor," the bureau's experts said in their report, "is the increased participation of women in the labor force," which has "led to increased economic independence among many women."

"Other factors possibly related," the bureau said, "are the increased availability of public assistance . . . as well as the changing attitude toward independent living among women today."

The rise of the female headed family has been most pronounced among blacks. Nearly 40 percent of all black children now live in such families. Since 1960, the total of all families in the country has gone up 21 per cent, the number of black female-headed families, 92 per cent.

The bureau said a rising percentage of women who head families are young, divorced and separated or single, and a declining percentage are middle-aged and widowed. More than half these women work, about a third of their families depend entirely on earnings for their incomes, and only about 11 per cent depend entirely on welfare or Social Security for income.

Median income of female-headed families is only about half the national median. In 1972 it was \$5,342 for all female-headed families, \$6,213 for white and \$3,840 for black. The poverty cutoff, according to the government, is now about \$4,500 a year for a family of four.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GOODLING (at the request of Mr. RHODES), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. LOTT (at the request of Mr. RHODES), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. TREEN (at the request of Mr. RHODES), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. O'BRIEN, for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PARRIS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. KEMP, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. SKUBITZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. HOGAN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GINN) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BINGHAM, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FLOOD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOWARD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KOCH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MEZVINSKY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SEIBERLING, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CHAPPELL, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PARRIS) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. WHITEHURST in two instances.

Mr. COLLINS of Texas in four instances.

Mr. HUDNUT.

Mr. HANRAHAN in two instances.

Mr. BROTZMAN.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona.

Mr. BELL.

Mr. WALSH.

Mr. ARCHER in three instances.

Mr. LANDGREBE in two instances.

Mr. HOSMER in three instances.

Mr. CARTER in two instances.

Mr. HOGAN in five instances.

Mr. FRENZEL.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GINN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FISHER in four instances.

Mr. BRINKLEY.
 Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.
 Mr. RARICK in three instances.
 Mr. ANDERSON of California in two instances.
 Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS.
 Mr. MURPHY of New York.
 Mr. MOLLOHAN.
 Mr. MURTHA in two instances.
 Mr. SYMINGTON in two instances.
 Mr. WON PAT in two instances.
 Mr. EVINS of Tennessee.
 Mr. PATMAN.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GINN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, August 12, 1974, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2645. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize the Civil Aeronautics Board to assess civil penalties; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2646. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases in which the authority contained in section 212(d)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of certain aliens, together with a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 212(d)(6) of the Act [8 U.S.C. 1182(d)(6)]; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MATSUNAGA: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1307. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 7917. A bill to provide minimum disclosure standards for written consumer product warranties against

defect or malfunction; to define minimum Federal content standards for such warranties; to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act in order to improve its consumer protection activities; and for other purposes (Rept. No. 93-1275). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GILMAN:

H.R. 16355. A bill to provide for a program of assistance to State governments in reforming their real property tax laws and providing relief from real property taxes for low-income individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEMP (for himself, Mr. BOB WILSON, and Mr. DEVINE):

H.R. 16356. A bill to reestablish the fiscal integrity of the Government of the United States and its monetary policy, through the establishment of controls with respect to the levels of its revenues and budget outlays, the issuance of money, and the preparation of the budget, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOAKLEY:

H.R. 16357. A bill to authorize the establishment of an older worker community service program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 16358. A bill to amend the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 to provide for investigations and expenditure analyses of the use of public funds; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 16359. A bill to amend title XVI of the Social Security Act to provide that inmates of county homes and similar institutions for the elderly who are contributing to their own support and maintenance may qualify for supplemental security income benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 16360. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to permit donations of surplus supplies and equipment to older Americans; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 16361. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to investigate and report to the Congress with respect to whether certain railroad facilities and equipment meet Federal safety standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 16362. A bill to establish a Marine Fisheries Conservation Fund; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 16363. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for annual adjustments in the amount of personal ex-

emptions and the amount of the standard deduction to reflect increases in the cost of living; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 16364. A bill to amend title XVI of the Social Security Act to provide for emergency assistance grants to recipients of supplemental security income benefits, to authorize cost-of-living increase in such benefits and in State supplementary payments, prevent reductions in such benefits because of social security benefit increases, to provide reimbursement to States for home relief payments to disabled applicants prior to determination of their disability, to permit payment of such benefits directly to drug addicts and alcoholics (without a third-party payee) in certain cases, and to continue on a permanent basis the provision making supplemental security income recipients eligible for food stamps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 16365. A bill to increase deposit insurance from \$20,000 to \$60,000; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MATHIAS of Georgia:

H. Con. Res. 595. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that Richard M. Nixon not be prosecuted for any offense, whether State or Federal, allegedly committed while he was in office as President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STUCKEY:

H. Con. Res. 596. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that Richard M. Nixon not be prosecuted for any offense, whether State or Federal, allegedly committed while he was in office as President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. SHOUP introduced a bill (H.R. 16366) for the relief of M. Sgt. Gary O. Ostlund, U.S. Army, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

468. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the chairman, Midwestern Governors' Conference, Lincoln, Nebr., relative to agricultural imports; to the Committee on Agriculture.

469. Also, petition of the Monroe County Legislature, N.Y., relative to supplemental security income benefits under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE—Friday, August 9, 1974

The Senate met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. WILLIAM PROX-MIRE, a Senator from the State of Wisconsin.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

God of our fathers and our God, by whose providence this Nation was born and by whom we have been guarded and guided, in this hour of mingled tragedy and hope, lift our lives into the clear light of Thy presence and encompass

us with Thy love. By the miracle of Thy grace transform this time of sorrow and judgment into a season of cleansing and healing.

Deal graciously, O Lord, with our departing President. Accord him appreciation for every noble achievement, forgiveness for every acknowledged wrong, and grant him a new life of usefulness and inner peace. Surround his family with Thy comfort and love.

Grant to Thy servant Gerald Ford, on this day of dedication, a vivid awareness of Thy presence and the assurance of Thy supporting strength. Endow him

plenteously with the sinews of Thy spirit, with moral courage, with wisdom beyond his own, and with power to lead the Republic in reconciliation and unity, in peace and prosperity, in justice and righteousness.

Chastened and cleansed, but full of hope and faith, help us O God, in our private lives and as a people to walk in the ways of Thy commandments, to live by the truth, to do justly, to love mercy and to serve Thee with our whole heart and mind and strength and that Thy kingdom may come and Thy will be done on Earth. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C. August 9, 1974.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. WILLIAM PROXMIRE, a Senator from the State of Wisconsin, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
President pro tempore.

Mr. PROXMIRE thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, August 8, 1974, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PERMISSION TO SUBMIT A REPORT ON S. 3717 TODAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be permitted to file not later than 5 p.m. today a report on S. 3717, a bill extending the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act of 1974.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHARGÉ D'AFFAIRES OF THE NETHERLANDS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter which I have just received from Baron A. N. van Aerssen, Chargé d'Affaires of the Netherlands, having to do with newspaper stories which have appeared indicating there might be a possible cut in Dutch forces allotted to NATO.

There being no objection, the communication was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
August 7, 1974.

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Recently I read your statement made in the Senate on July 15th about the Dutch defense white-paper, as printed in the Congressional Record of that day, jointly with a Washington Post article about NATO criticism directed at the same white-paper, and an article by yourself in the Claremont Men's College Magazine.

Your statement and the publication of your above mentioned article in the same context, seemed to imply that the Netherlands Government had decided or was planning to reduce unilaterally the ready strength of the troops committed to the integrated NATO defense in Central-Europe.

Allow me, dear Senator, to draw your attention to the following.

First of all the Netherlands Government has pledged explicitly within NATO not to reduce the manpower of its land forces in Central-Europe as long as the negotiations on mutual balanced force reductions have not led to the desired results.

In the second place: it is true that some numerical reductions in the personnel of the Dutch Navy and Air-force are envisaged, but this will mainly be a result of replacement of existing larger and outdated equipment by modern and more sophisticated equipment. As an example I would like to mention the introduction within the Navy of the new frigates, which will carry smaller crews than the present ships of that type, due to extensive automatization.

I cannot agree with the statement in the Washington Post that several Hawk anti-aircraft units will be abolished. There will be no reduction in Hawk units, but only a redeployment, whereby some units will be used for anti-aircraft protection of airfields in the Netherlands. All units will furthermore be modernized in accordance with the Alliance Hawk Improvement Programme.

The main thrust of the Netherlands defense white-paper is an attempt to reduce the operation and maintenance costs in the coming decade, so that a higher percentage of the defense-budget can be made available for investment in new and modern military equipment. This will permit in the coming years to maintain a contribution to the integrated NATO defense of Western Europe that is qualitatively strong and efficient.

Further my Government is convinced that NATO countries should more than hitherto concentrate on specific defense activities, so as to make their respective contributions to the Alliance more cost effective.

If you think it would be appropriate to insert the text of this letter in the Congressional Record I would certainly welcome this.

In the hope that my explanation will have been helpful to elucidate somewhat the rather confused picture about this subject created by some comments in the press, I remain, my dear Senator,

Yours sincerely,

Baron A.N. VAN AERSEN,
Chargé d'Affaires a.i. of the Netherlands.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution:

H.R. 69. An act to amend and extend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 1104. A joint resolution to extend by 62 days the expiration date of the Export Administration Act of 1969.

The enrolled bill and joint resolution were subsequently signed by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. PROXMIRE).

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand

in adjournment until noon on Monday next.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATE RESOLUTION 379—RELATING TO CLERICAL AND OTHER ASSISTANTS TO THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration. This resolution is offered on behalf of the distinguished Republican leader, the distinguished assistant majority leader (Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD), the distinguished assistant Republican leader (Mr. GRIFFIN), and myself.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the clerical and other assistants to the Vice President on the payroll of the Senate on the date prior to the date he assumes the Office of President of the United States, shall be continued on such payroll at their respective salaries for a period of not to exceed sixty days, such sums to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate: *Provided*, That any such assistants continued on the payroll, while so continued, shall perform their duties for which employed and the Secretary of the Senate is hereby authorized and directed to remove from such payroll any such assistants who are not attending to the duties for which their services are continued.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 379) was considered and agreed to.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 108—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION EXTENDING BEST WISHES TO GERALD R. FORD

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. Mr. President, I offer on behalf of myself and the distinguished majority leader (Mr. MANSFIELD), and on behalf of the distinguished assistant minority leader (Mr. GRIFFIN) and the distinguished majority leader (Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD) and on behalf of the membership of the U.S. Senate, a concurrent resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be stated by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 108) extending best wishes to Gerald R. Ford.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 108) was considered and agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution with its preamble reads as follows:

S. CON. RES. 108

Whereas Gerald R. Ford was a Member of Congress for 25 years; and

Whereas he is known to the Congress as a good and faithful friend; and

Whereas he assumes today the Office of President of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress extends to Gerald R. Ford its sincere best wishes, its assurances of firm cooperation and its fervent hopes for success in office.

THE PRESIDENCY

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. Mr. President, and now we have a new President—those words have a historic ring—as the country gathers itself together, reaches for the sources of its strength, seeks the opportunity now offered for reconciliation and respite, embraces gladly the hope of unity, and welcomes the initiation of a new spirit of cooperation.

We are all mortal, and we are all sinners, and we can all echo the Book of Common Prayer: that we have done those things which we ought not to have done and we have left undone those things which we ought to have done.

But that sonorous, rich, and immortal book also guides us with this prayer of blessing for the President of the United States as it says:

Grant unto the President and to all in authority the wisdom and strength to know and to do Thy will.

I think that is all that the American people will ask now of President Gerald R. Ford, who has been our friend in the Legislature for so long a time. We pray with him, and with his family, and with all those who wish well for the Republic, for wisdom and strength to know and to do Thy will, to walk humbly before our God, to do justly, and to love mercy.

These are the simple things which are so majestic in their import and in their meaning to all of us in this matchless country which we love so much.

When the leadership of the House and the Senate left the office of the President of the United States last night and walked down the steps of the Executive Office Building, I think we were all touched by the strains of a cherished song carried to us on the night air from the gates at Pennsylvania Avenue. The people were there, the people who approve and the people who disapprove. But the sound of what the people sang will live with me forever:

"God bless America, land that I love."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I was impressed by what the distinguished Republican leader has just said. I am glad to join him in extending our best wishes and our hopes for the future to the man who will be the 38th President of the United States at 12 o'clock noon today.

Jerry Ford has had a remarkable career because he has been so unremarkable himself. He is in reality a man of the House who was transported, because of the constitutional requirements, into this Chamber to be its Presiding Officer. But we know where Jerry Ford's heart is: in the Chamber in which he spent approximately 25 years, in which he performed with diligence, attention to duty, and as the best possible leader for the members of his party who comprised the minority in that Chamber.

Now he leaves the House and leaves the Senate and goes to a new home at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. He goes there with a clean mind, with a clean heart, and with a clean record. Lest there be any misinterpretation or speculation about what I mean by "record," I would point to the fact that he is the first appointed Vice President and that he is the first Vice President in that category who had to pass scrutiny by the appropriate committees in the House and the Senate, and then by the Senate and the House as a whole. So everything about Jerry Ford is laid bare for all to see.

I think that we can have a great deal of confidence in this unassuming man from the Midwest who always lets you know where he stands and who always appreciates an opposite point of view and understands it. So I think this Republic, in this hour of travail, in these troubled times, is extremely fortunate to have a man of the caliber of Gerald Ford as Chief Executive of this Nation.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly to me?

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. Yes, I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I am impressed by the remarks of the Senator from Pennsylvania, and knowing him as I do, I know those remarks come from his heart and his head, too, if I may use that expression. They have a meaning at any time, but especially at this time. I commend him for what he said, as I do the majority leader.

I have no prepared remarks, Mr. President. Along with all others, I have been concerned with conditions as well as the future of our country, the domestic problems and also our foreign policy; and all these things that have happened now are in the past as far as I am concerned.

With reference to investigation in Watergate affairs my conclusion is that every Member of the Congress has done his duty as he saw his responsibility.

I agree that each Member sought his duty and did his duty, whether he agrees with me or not as to any point. I am willing to let the past be the past on it. I hope—I believe this is the way the people of America feel. Now they want us to make a new start. I know I want to make a new start.

So far as doing his duty, I think that as to the actions of President Nixon yesterday and today he was doing his duty as he saw it. That which has been done, has been done, and I accept his judgment as to his resignation which was a courageous deed and a punishing thing to him. Enough punishment is enough.

As we look to the future—and we must look to the future rather than try to relive the past—I think the first step is, as the Senator from Pennsylvania said, to back our President-to-be, Vice President Ford.

He is worthy of our confidence, as I understand from all of you who have known him better than I have. What I know certainly leads me to have confidence in him.

But for any man to effectively serve as President he has to have a lot of help. He has to be tough-minded and courageous and make hard decisions. To have any sound policy either at home or

abroad, he has to have a broad base of operations and a lot of backing.

These conditions are what we need now. Speaking for myself, and in my humble way, I am going to try to do my part in making the next administration effective for a strong, safe, and honorable country—our country.

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. I thank the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, whom we all honor as one of the wisest Members of our entire membership. I agree that indeed, enough is enough.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the minority leader and the majority leader. Less than 1 hour from now, Gerald Ford is going to become the 38th President of the United States. The strongest office in the world will change hands. I think it is important to note that it is going to change hands without any tanks surrounding the Capital, without any troops, without any coup; it is going to change hands because President Nixon is turning it over.

As we listened to his remarks last night, we heard him say that he was doing this without any malice, without any ill feelings to anyone. President Nixon realized that he had lost his mandate to rule.

We all feel a tremendous sadness and sorrow today for President Nixon and for his family. The guilt of Watergate is not vested in one man or in one group of people.

I think the guilt of Watergate is really something that each of us has some share in. The Congress has a share, because Watergate did not start a year ago or 2 years ago. The process that brought it about started many, many years ago.

Congress, over these years, has surrendered its power and failed to carry out its constitutional duty of being a coequal branch and a check on the executive. It certainly has to share the blame for what happened.

The businessman who contributed money and did not want his name recorded, who wanted to send money in cash, in thousand-dollar bills, has a part of the guilt to share. The citizen who either failed to carry out his duty as a citizen—and that is just as real a duty as the duty of the President of the United States—by being aware of what was going on at elections, by seeking out candidates, not voting for them because of slogans or emotional issues, but really trying to find out what they stood for, who would be willing to go and work for people, who did not, perhaps, have ways of raising large sums, or were not sure winners, but would go out and actively participate in the electoral process—certainly the citizens have a share, too; the citizens who over the years have made the President a king, with all the trappings of royalty, to the point where we expected him to assert the theory of the divine right of kings and divine inspiration—which we found out a long time ago kings do not have, though a king, like everyone else, has a thirst for power, when that power continues to reside there.

Today is a new day, Mr. President. I think history always has points of time

at which civilizations, governments, and people get an opportunity to change directions. I think we have that opportunity today in this country.

I think we have, in GERRY FORD, an honest, God-fearing, and God-loving man, a man who wants to do right. He has been a team player. He has been a Member of Congress for over 25 years. I think now we have the opportunity, as Democrats and Republicans, to work with a man who wants to work for this country. And as we do that, I think we will have the opportunity to work, really, for a new morality, when we will not say that it has always been done this way. How many people have said, "You should not blame President Nixon, because everyone has done this" or "All politicians do this."

Maybe some of them have over the years. Maybe some of us have. But today we have an opportunity to change that, so that that is not the expected thing, so that it is not considered to be what the people are entitled to—and we know it is not. A new ethic between businessmen and government, that they are not going to expect contributions in return for favors, and that they are not going to expect tax writeoffs and privileges because of the money they give. A new ethic among our citizens, that they are not going to break laws that they wish to break, but still demand accountability from others. A new sharing for the common good, a time when we have got to realize that if we are going to do something about the economy and the inflation we are in, no one group can expect to say, "Take it out of the military," or, "Take it out of the people programs," or, "Take it out of here, but do not bother me, do not do anything to what I have and where I stand."

We have got to come together with a plan that perhaps will cost a sacrifice for all of us, but a plan we can support. A new responsibility for citizenship, whereby we will not expect leaders, whether they be in the Senate or the President or anyone else, just to do the right thing on all occasions if all of us do not participate and take our parts as citizens.

We need a new respect for others, to help us get rid of some of the hatred and some of the problems we have in this country from one group trying to take advantage or seek something from another group.

Mr. President, I think when history records Watergate, the important thing is going to be what was said about the events that led up to Watergate; but I think the important thing is going to be whether history will record that Watergate was a turning point, a point at which we changed directions. Because that is the opportunity that I see we have today; and if we seize that opportunity, as I think we must, then it will be recorded as that point of time at which this country decided to go forward, that point of time at which America went forward to carry out what I think is the divine destiny that this country has, which has not yet been fulfilled, not only to provide prosperity for our citizens, but to provide leadership for the rest of the world, because we are a free country and

we are a free people, and ours is the experiment that shows whether free people in a free society can govern themselves and do it properly.

If we can do that, I think we can set an example that the rest of the world can follow.

I join with all of my colleagues in the the Senate, and I think every American, in wishing Gerald Ford Godspeed, and offer my hand to him in any way that I can to help him in the task of leadership that he has ahead for our country.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TALMADGE. The President has made a painful decision which I believe to be in the best interests of the United States at this critical time. This is not a time for recrimination. It is not a time to further inflame the political wounds that have polarized our people and weakened the Nation. The resignation of the President is a sad event that is unparalleled in the history of our Republic. It is not a time to unnecessarily dwell on the past. More than ever before, we need to look ahead. Now is the time for everyone in Government, for all Members of Congress, for both political parties, and for all Americans to join forces and unite in a common effort to build upon the greatness of the United States. Our Nation has come through a period of prolonged agony. But our Constitution is sound and the Government is stable and functional. I wish President Ford every success and I pledge my support in the difficult tasks he faces. I pray to God that all Americans will work together to strengthen our Nation.

ORDER TO VACATE REMAINING SPECIAL ORDERS

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining special orders be vacated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, are we in morning business?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business for not to exceed 30 minutes, with statements limited to 5 minutes.

Is there morning business to be transacted at this time?

ORDER FOR STAR PRINT OF S. 1361—GENERAL REVISION OF COPYRIGHT LAW

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, I request unanimous consent that there be a star

print of S. 1361, as reported by the Commerce Committee.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

QUORUM CALL

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF THE RAIL PASSENGER SERVICE ACT

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to reconsider the bill, H.R. 15427, together with the third reading, and that section 1, which reads "That this Act may be cited as the Amtrak Improvement Act of 1974," which was inadvertently left out in the reprinting of the bill, be inserted, and that the bill as thus amended be repassed.

Mr. President, I understand this has clearance from the minority side of the aisle.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If there is no further morning business, morning business is closed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 3717. A bill to extend the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act of 1973 (Rept. No. 93-1082).

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

NOW TO THE FUTURE

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I view the resignation of Richard Nixon with mixed emotions. It is a sad ending of a career of a man who, had it not been for Watergate, and had it not been for a hostility toward Congress and a disregard for basic constitutional principles so often evidenced, might well have ranked with some of the best of American Presidents. It is also a personal tragedy for Mr. Nixon and, most of all, for his family.

It is a moment in history that the American people will not forget. It is a sad and unhappy time.

History, I am sure, will record the impressive changes and breakthroughs achieved by Richard Nixon. In fairness, one cannot overlook the fact that he ended America's highly unpopular participation in the Vietnam war. There were many of us in Congress who supported the President in that effort and

in the effort to bring home the prisoners of war.

History cannot overlook the fact that Mr. Nixon, through his appointments to the U.S. Supreme Court, ended what was, in the opinion of many people, an era of extreme and unsound activism on the part of that Court and turned it back to the mainstream of moderation in the application of judicial power.

History will record that he ended the drafting of America's young men. He had the wisdom and the courage to bring about a new era of understanding in the relations between the United States and the People's Republic of China, and between the United States and the Soviet Union.

History will also record that he and his brilliant Secretary of State created the best prospects for peace in a quarter of a century in the Middle East.

So, along with Mr. Nixon's failures, history, I am sure, will record these successes.

When and where and how and why the Nixon administration went wrong is a matter that lies beyond the scope of my brief remarks. History will deal with that, too. I suppose that each of us has within himself the elements of self-destruction. These self-destructive forces work in many ways for many people. Sometimes they will triumph over judgment and reason and the power of will. Unfortunately, they prevailed in the sad ending of what might have been a most promising and brilliant Presidency.

But much of this sordid chapter is behind us, and we must look now to the future history of our country. The orderly transition of this highest office will again prove the resiliency of the American people and the durability of the American system.

I am confident that the American people of both major political parties will rally behind Mr. Ford as President, for our common task now is to heal the divisiveness that has rent our country and to get on with the business of meeting and solving its pressing problems.

Mr. Ford's many years of service in the Congress should provide him with a unique understanding of those problems. He will, in due time, presumably, bring with him to the Presidency a new team to deal with domestic matters, and, through the retention of Dr. Kissinger, President Ford should be able also to maintain U.S. dynamism and direction in foreign affairs. But he will need the support and the prayers of us all as he takes on the heavy responsibilities of the most difficult job in the world.

I wish Mr. Ford well, and I shall work with him in every way I can conscientiously do so, to deal with our country's economic problems and to promote peace and keep the Nation strong:

*The Moving Finger writes; and, having writ,
Moves on: nor all thy Piety nor Wit
Shall lure it back to cancel half a Line,
Nor all thy Tears wash out a Word of it.*

NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. Mr. President, I am delighted the Committee on Appropriations, in a report submitted by Sen-

ator PROXMIER, has recommended an appropriation of \$50 million for the national flood insurance program.

This program, established in 1973 under the Flood Disaster Protection Act, provided protection for communities in flood-prone areas. Response to the program has been tremendous, and continued funding will aid the administrators of the program in coping with the increased workload. Also, the appropriation provides for extensive studies and surveys establishing flood risk zones and determining the amount of protection needed for each area.

Adequate flood protection is vital to the citizens of Pennsylvania and the Nation, and I commend the committee for its recommendation of funding for this important program.

THE PRESIDENCY

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, President Nixon's decision to resign from the Presidency is a deep tragedy for his family and a national tragedy that touches all Americans. At the same time, I have to read into the President's decision his own conclusion that he could not have survived the impeachment process and that the Nation should be spared that agony.

While this decision marks the end of an agonizing period of stress for our Nation, I think it would be a mistake not to recognize that the events of the past 2 years have, in fact, reaffirmed our Nation's enduring commitment to the rule of law. This is the bedrock on which our constitutional democracy rests. That it has survived this painful period should be reassuring to all Americans.

Our purpose now must be to unite behind Vice President Ford as he assumes the Presidency and the responsibility to continue our Nation's leadership toward peace throughout the world and the solution of our problems here at home.

RICHARD NIXON—LONGTIME FRIEND

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, yesterday was one of the saddest days of my life.

Twenty-eight years ago I was sworn in as a freshman Congressman along with Richard Nixon. In the days that followed we became close friends and fellow members of the now famous "Chowder and Marching Club," a group of 15 freshmen which met weekly to compare notes and discuss legislation. That close friendship has never been broken through all the years that followed.

I still cherish that friendship. My admiration for his ability and my faith in his fundamental sincerity remains unabated. Through the years I have watched him fight his way up against tremendous odds. I have seen him beaten for President and beaten for Governor of California and come back after both of these defeats to win the Presidency. History will record and time will never obscure what he has achieved as President. He wound down the war in Asia and brought a half million American boys home. He breathed new life into the

NATO alliance. He opened the gates for communication with Russia and China and struggled manfully and with bright promise of success for mutual reduction of armaments. He shifted billions of dollars that we were spending on weaponry to the health, education, and welfare of our people.

He made grievous mistakes and unlike some of his predecessors he has paid dearly for them. He was unwise in the choice of many of his closest associates and highest Government officials and persisted in retaining them after they had betrayed him. Though enraged and horrified by the sordid story of Watergate he inexcusably closed his eyes to it and participated in its concealment. And now at the end of the long travail during which he must have suffered indescribable anguish while resolutely attempting to carry on his work at home and abroad, he is compelled to surrender the Presidency to bring peace to a distressed and distraught Nation.

All through these months I have refused to judge him until the time should come when as a Senator I would be forced to sit in judgment. I shall not judge him now.

Last night with others of his longtime associates and close friends in the Senate and House I was called to the White House to say farewell before he went on the air. With us he could not maintain the composure that characterized his public appearance and we saw his naked anguish. At 2 o'clock this morning he telephoned me to say goodbye. Can you wonder that in this hour I am still his friend?

PRESIDENT FORD AND THE CAREER SERVICE

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, in this time of transition, all Americans are, I trust, committed to full support of President Gerald R. Ford. Certainly, that is true of all of us in this Chamber, who desire to put the shoulder to the wheel and give full measure to efforts to solve this Nation's problems.

Today, though I claim no status as a spokesman for our career civil servants, I do speak as chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, a post which affords me great opportunity to know and judge the Federal work force.

Like Americans everywhere, the career service has been troubled by the ever unfolding events of the past 2 years, only more so. Yet, Mr. President, they have continued to perform their tasks day by day and the people's business has proceeded. I say that in tribute to the nearly 3 million Federal civilian personnel, including postal workers.

On January 16, then Vice President Ford addressed Civil Service Commission employees at ceremonies marking the 91st anniversary of the Federal civil service. Federal workers who review his remarks on that occasion will know that in President Ford they have a Chief Executive who respects them and their work. Indeed, he prefaced his speech with two appropriate words: "Thank you."

Mr. President, I am confident that the career employees of the Federal Govern-

ment will be in the forefront as this Nation moves to heal its wounds and solve its problems. I, too, would like to say to our career employees "thank you" for their professional, dedicated devotion to the public's business through a trying period.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that President Ford's remarks to civil service employees last January 16 be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Civil Service Journal, January-March 1974]

A STRONG CAREER SERVICE IS ONE OF THE GREATEST STRENGTHS OF OUR DEMOCRATIC PROCESS

(By Vice President Gerald R. Ford)

In twenty-five years of service in Washington, this is my first opportunity to address the employees of the Civil Service Commission. I hope it won't be the last, for I am very interested in what you are doing and in how well you are doing it.

I congratulate you on your 91st birthday, and I add my very sincere compliments to those who will be honored here today, for their achievements and for their service.

For me this is an opportunity to speak to every man and woman in the career civil service.

Underlying every remark I will make are two words: Thank you.

I am convinced that one of the best ideas the people of America have ever expressed, and one of the best acts ever to come out of the Congress, was the creation of a career civil service back in 1883.

I believe a strong career service is one of the greatest strengths of our democratic process, and one of the best guarantees of sound, effective, and efficient government—even more so in 1974 than in 1883.

It is unfortunate that the term "civil service" often conjures up the very opposite of what I am talking about, for in this enlightened world there are some who still equate civil service with security and routine.

To me, civil service has a much higher meaning.

It is a work environment for which top-notch people are selected on the basis of ability. A place where the *product* of one's hands is more important than the *color* of one's hands. A place where the work itself takes precedence over the sex of the person doing it. A place where service to the people transcends party labels. A place where the word "service" means exactly what it says.

To me, an old Navy veteran, civil service also means a taut ship steaming on a steady course. Whatever squalls and heavy swells may come, the ship rides steady and true.

When the Nation was confronted with the energy crisis, a new Government agency had to be created almost overnight. Drawing on the expertise and competence already available in the civil service, the Federal Energy Office was in business within 2 weeks.

In August of 1971 President Nixon decided to take quick action to curb runaway inflation. The Office of Emergency Preparedness had to have an explosive mobilization. Fifteen minutes after the President announced the price freeze, George Lincoln had the OEP regional directors on a conference telephone call.

"Tomorrow morning," he told them, "you will move out of your offices and open up in the biggest city in your region. GSA will provide space, and the Civil Service Commission will give you personnel from other agencies. You'll be ready for business Monday morning."

Within 60 hours OEP was operational in 10

regional offices. Within a week the network was expanded to include 360 IRS offices and 2,800 offices of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service. This meant better service to citizens outside major cities.

More than a decade ago, the United States was challenged to put a man on the moon before 1970—a task that strained science and technology to their outermost limits. It was done through a productive joint effort of Government and industry . . . and one of the men in charge Robert Gilruth, had this to say: "Nowhere but in the Federal service could we have found the quality and quantity of talent required to carry out a mission of this size."

Or take the problem of hijackings. Of course, we might have one tomorrow—you never know. But to all intents and purposes, Government action with private followup has effectively clamped the lid on aircraft hijacking in the United States. What was the secret? Expertise already in Government, and rapid, excellent recruiting at a time when Sky Marshals were our need.

These are the kinds of "mission impossible" that never get into prime time on television. They become mission *possible* because we have competent people in the civil service who can hit the ground running.

To me, civil service means tremendous knowledge and a great depth of understanding on the part of career people who have devoted their lives to government. You can take almost any type of legislation that comes before the Congress, and I can give you an example of how the knowledge of career people has provided information that made a given bill an even better law.

To me, from my new vantage point in the executive branch of government, civil service means a solid foundation of competence assuring that the mandate the voters have given the political leadership will be carried out.

These are some pretty generous words I have been using to portray and praise the civil service: competence . . . steadfastness . . . knowledge . . . dependability . . . responsiveness. Yet each one is deliberately chosen, and equally well deserved.

The people, the Congress, and the Presidency under Chester Alan Arthur can claim credit for starting a career civil service, and for a great deal of care and attention in seeing to it that the concept of a merit system of public employment became more than just a concept; that it became a living, breathing, producing arm of good government.

The transition from concept to reality is where the work came in—and here the credit belongs to the Commission itself—to the outstanding men and women who have served as Commissioners over the years, and to the career staff of the agency—past and present.

I am particularly aware of the achievements of the Commission during the last 5 years under Bob Hampton's splendid leadership in the areas of equal opportunity within the Federal service; the training and development of employees at all levels, from entry to executive level; the administration of the labor relations program; the strengthening of State and local government through the intergovernmental personnel program; the improvements in management in all Federal agencies through evaluation of their manpower management programs; and the program for the employment of Vietnam-era veterans.

As a result of these activities, the environment of the Federal civil service now sets a good example for all employers. People are selected on the basis of ability. Equal opportunity is a way of life. People receive training, which will increase their ability to do better work. Employees have a voice in matters that affect them on the job. Excellence is encouraged, recognized, and rewarded. There is pride in accomplishment. The work is exciting, for it is worth doing.

In short, this is an environment in which the civil service has become more reliable, more efficient, more competent, and more responsive than before.

And there is awareness, on the part of elected leadership as well as on the part of the 2½ million men and women who comprise the civil service, that the service exists to carry out the programs that people expect of their national government. That, in the final sense, is what government in a democracy is all about.

So I salute the career civil service on its 91st birthday, and I extend best wishes to all career employees in the years ahead. You are doing a great job, and we thank you.

UNIVERSITY OF MID-AMERICA

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, on July 29, 1974, at Kansas City, Mo., five Midwestern universities initiated a new regional education institution of great promise for the future of higher education in the United States. The new University of Mid-America—UMA—represents a major step forward in "open learning", the process of bringing college level courses to people in their homes.

The University of Mid-America builds on the pioneering work of the State University of Nebraska—SUN, an "open learning" program for Nebraskans which has been operating as a project of the University of Nebraska.

Both SUN and UMA have received support from the National Institute of Education. I am well aware, Mr. President, of criticism leveled at the Institute. At the same time, I am aware of the difficulties inherent in bringing strong leadership and effective coordination to a field as complex as educational research. I believe that through its support of SUN and UMA the National Institute of Education is investing wisely in developments of potential benefit to the entire Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two items be included at this point in the RECORD. The first is the text of the official announcement of the establishment of the University of Mid-America. It contains the names of the participating universities and the principal officers of this important undertaking. The second item is a letter to this Senator from President D. B. Varner of the University of Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HRUSKA. In his letter President Varner outlines expansion plans for UMA and discusses the importance for this new "open learning" program of continued support by the National Institute of Education for a period of 5 years. At the end of the 5-year period, plans call for UMA to be self-supporting.

This program is highly significant. It is unique in all phases of postsecondary education. It is innovative in its proposed scale, but very well demonstrated in its earlier development stages.

The hope of meaningful progress in improving the quality and accessibility of education will gain new vigor by reason of this newly launched creation.

EXHIBIT 1

(The University of Mid-America—University of Kansas, Kansas State University, Iowa

State University, University of Missouri, and University of Nebraska)

UNIVERSITY OF MID-AMERICA TO BRING NEW OFF-CAMPUS PROGRAMS TO THE MIDWEST

KANSAS CITY, Mo.—Five midwestern state universities announced here Monday that they will cooperate to develop a new regional educational institution to be known as the University of Mid-America.

At an afternoon news conference, chief executives of the University of Missouri, the University of Kansas, Kansas State University, Iowa State University and the University of Nebraska announced that the University of Mid-America (UMA) would become a new regional "open learning" university which makes college-level courses available to people in their homes.

UMA, which will be managed as a joint project by the five-university consortium, will coordinate development of open learning educational systems in the Midwest, while it designs and produces multimedia courses that will be available for use in the region and around the nation.

The five university presidents will serve as members of the UMA Board of Trustees, the chief policy-making body, while other policy guidance will be provided by an Academic Council of five faculty members from each participating university and a National Council of Advisors of laymen and educators from the Midwest region and the nation.

UMA was formally incorporated under the laws of Nebraska last Friday in Lincoln, Nebraska.

At an organizational meeting Monday, the trustees elected James McCain, president of Kansas State University, as chairman of the board and named C. Brice Ratchford, president of the University of Missouri, as vice chairman.

D. B. Varner, president of the University of Nebraska, was elected president of UMA, and Jack McBride, executive director of the University of Nebraska's S-U-N (State University of Nebraska) Project, was elected UMA executive vice president. Ronald J. Turner was elected secretary and William H. Eberle treasurer. At S-U-N, Turner is the assistant to the director and Eberle is director of business and finance.

McCain, speaking for the UMA Board of Trustees, said that in the S-U-N Project the University of Nebraska has established a program of potential national significance in "open learning," the descriptive phrase for new efforts to provide college-level educational opportunities to people in their homes.

McCain said all the communications media, including television, radio, telephone systems and eventually perhaps computers and satellites, will be combined by UMA with print materials and audio tape cassettes as part of packaged courses.

S-U-N's open learning research efforts over the past months have been funded by the National Institute of Education (NIE), the new research arm of the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. This fall, S-U-N with UMA support will return to NIE, seeking multiple year funding on behalf of the unique regional university.

Ratchford said that in the initial phases of UMA development, courses will be produced for UMA through a subcontract relationship with the University of Nebraska and S-U-N, while the several universities provide leadership for development of delivery systems which can provide postsecondary learning opportunities from border to border in each state.

Varner, whose leadership was instrumental in creation of UMA, said he believed the five state universities were creating a unique new institution in American postsecondary education.

Leadership for UMA development, he noted, will be a joint enterprise by the faculty and staffs of the several institutions involved.

"The creation of UMA marks an important first in cooperative regional educational endeavors," said Varner. "I believe it may lead to other successful ventures in sharing of resources and expertise across state boundaries."

All five institutions are members of the Mid-America State Universities Association (MASUA), a regional association of the five schools and the University of Oklahoma and Oklahoma State University.

McCain said the MASUA schools had provided the leadership for UMA planning during the past several months. As a next stage of development, he said, the MASUA schools will act as catalysts to develop plans for delivery systems involving all segments of postsecondary education in each state.

"This is a significant date in the history of higher education in the Midwest and in the nation," said McCain. "We see this project as a way to expand the important resources of the MASUA universities to serve people from all walks of life and at all ages."

Also attending the news conference were Chancellor Archie Dykes of the University of Kansas and Assistant Vice President Edwin C. Lewis of Iowa State University, who attended on behalf of Iowa State President W. Robert Parks.

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA,
Lincoln, Nebr., July 22, 1974.

Senator ROMAN HRUSKA,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HRUSKA: We were delighted to have the opportunity to visit with you on July 5th and brief you on the S-U-N project. There continues to be every evidence and this model regional open learning development is potentially highly significant to higher education in the Midwest and, indeed, nationally. The \$2 million the Office of Education, the National Institute of Education and private foundations have provided these past three and a half years has enabled this new educational concept to be extensively researched and developed. With operations planned to begin next January, indications are that this important experiment in higher education will prove highly successful.

I am pleased also to be able to give you the advance news that our regional postsecondary educational consortium is a reality. On July 29th, a news conference will be held in Kansas City to announce the formal incorporation of the University of Mid-America. This new and significant educational compact will be a non-profit corporation formed to pool the resources of seven major state universities in five midwestern states, and will be responsible for the design and development of open learning courses employing a new instructional design concept and a variety of educational technologies. UMA could, indeed, be this country's answer to the British Open University.

The initial incorporators of the University of Mid-America will be the University of Kansas, Kansas State University, University of Missouri, Iowa State University and the University of Nebraska. The University of Oklahoma and Oklahoma State University, it is believed, will very shortly join the compact and pool their resources as well. Historically, these seven institutions comprise the Mid-America State Universities Association; thus, the impetus for initial incorporation. However, the bylaws and articles of incorporation of the University of Mid-America will indicate that other states and educational institutions will be encouraged to join in this important educational endeavor.

Specifically, we are initially thinking of the contiguous states of Wyoming, Colorado, South Dakota and Montana. Initial contacts with major universities in the surrounding states indicate a high degree of interest. The new open learning courses are being so des-

igned as to allow their ready export and use in these as well as other states.

This most important national experiment has been carefully nurtured and supported by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. NIE officials are well aware of the potential importance of the S-U-N/UMA development as a significant improvement to higher education in this country. Pending the successful completion of certain work assignments during calendar 1974, it has been the joint plan of NIE staff and ourselves to seek a five year funding plan to allow full demonstration of the regional open learning model and development toward ultimate self-sufficiency.

With this project so carefully laid, it was with great concern that we learned of the potential reduction in budget for the National Institute of Education. This is most unfortunate and should represent a serious concern to all senators and representatives of the Midwest and Great Plains states. We would hope that you would so advise Members of Congress as to both the importance of this major educational development and the potential dangers of inadequate appropriations. The exact impact of the reduction of the NIE request on the University of Mid-America is not at this time clear. With inadequate funding for NIE, it could create important problems for the future development of this model regional open learning system. It is my impression we could limp along with a vastly reduced scope and service, but the full and exciting potential of the University of Mid-America and the opportunity to systematically improve higher education could suffer irreparable damage. I wanted to provide you with this latest information, with the hope that you might share it with your colleagues. I am sending a similar letter to Congressman Thone that he might discuss the problem with members of the House. The presidents of the other University of Mid-America institutions share my concern, and join me in urging your every assistance.

Yours truly,

D. B. VARNER,
President.

IMMUNITY AND AMNESTY

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as they have always done in times of transition, especially sudden transitions under unhappy circumstances, the American people and Congress are united today in support of our new President, Gerald Ford. With his long experience as a leading Member of Congress, President Ford is uniquely qualified to work in mutual trust and harmony with the Congress, and in so doing to restore unity and confidence in government to the American people.

As we offer our assistance to a new President, it is no less appropriate that we offer our best wishes to the departing President, Richard Nixon, along with an expression of appreciation for his contributions to world peace. As was evident in his speech last night, that is what he hopes to be remembered for. And as one who opposed his Vietnam policy but later came to admire and support his creative and successful initiatives for peace in relations with the Soviet Union and China and in the Middle East, I believe that hope will be realized. More than any other President since World War II, Mr. Nixon has grasped and acted upon the preeminent necessity of the post-war era. As he enunciated it in his fine speech of last June 5 at Annapolis:

In the nuclear age our first responsibility must be the prevention of a war that could destroy all society. We must never lose sight of this fundamental truth of modern international life.

For his grasp of this central truth, and for his diligent efforts to implement it—through “shared goals of coexistence” and “the shared practice of accommodation” as he then put it—Mr. Nixon has earned our gratitude and approbation.

We have come to the culmination of a long, abrasive and divisive controversy over our public morality. In the course of this controversy there has been, it seems to me, an excess of animosity and even vindictiveness on both sides. It would seem appropriate at this moment of transition to put an end to acrimony and accusation. There is no better way to do this than by laying the Watergate question to rest, and this can best be accomplished by permitting President Nixon to leave office in dignity, without further anxiety that he may be subjected to prosecution or harassment, and with approbation for his notable achievements in foreign relations. Although it seems that the Congress has no authority to grant immunity from prosecution, I hope that responsible Federal and State officials will share the conviction of many of us in Congress, that Mr. Nixon has paid a heavy and sufficient penalty for his actions by departing from office. In justice and decency, one hopes that he will be troubled no further.

It would be equally appropriate, Mr. President, to extend this amnesty to still another issue which has disrupted and divided our people for the last decade. I refer of course to the Vietnam war, and to the personal circumstances of those thousands of decent, honorable, and patriotic young Americans who found themselves unable to participate in that war. They, too it seems to me, are deserving of immunity from further punishment or prosecution. Unlike many of us who had the opportunity to dissent by speaking our minds, these individuals felt compelled to dissent from the war by refusing to participate in it. In war as in Watergate, the violation of law is a serious and unacceptable matter, even when the law seems to require actions which offend the conscience of individuals. The law must be enforced—that goes without saying—but there is and must be room within our system of laws to allow of conscience and dissent, and to accommodate to those circumstances wherein public law and personal morality seem to come in conflict with each other.

Under these rare and difficult conditions, a humane society takes resort to amnesty. I call, therefore, for amnesty to the departing President of the United States. I call as well, and with deep belief in its necessity and justice, for a general amnesty for those thousands of young Americans, some here at home, others in foreign exile, who refused as an act of conscience to serve in the war in Vietnam.

We have an opportunity at this mo-

ment of transition to clear the decks of lingering acrimony. As we clear the decks of Watergate, let us take this occasion to clear the decks of the other great moral issue of our time, the war in Vietnam.

RESIGNATION OF PRESIDENT NIXON

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the following is a statement I released after the announcement made last night by the President that he would resign today:

This is a sad and traumatic day for every American.

Although I deeply regret that events and circumstances have dictated the resignation of President Nixon, I accept the decision and believe it was “best for the nation.”

Richard Nixon, as a member of Congress, as Vice President, and as our President, has had a profound influence on American history. He has led America in directions where no other man succeeded and few would have dared.

He has been the nation's leader, and he has been my leader. I have, as governor and senator, supported most of his programs and I have agreed with his general philosophy of government.

Although I cannot defend his performance or the performance of those around him in regard to Watergate, we should not forget his record of outstanding accomplishments over the last 25 years.

I was proud of then-Vice President Nixon when he withstood the derision, the taunts, and the serious danger to his own life when he toured South America for President Eisenhower.

I was glad he was our emissary when he stood up to Khrushchev in the kitchen debates in Russia.

I believed him when he promised as a presidential candidate to get us out of Vietnam. He got us out, and it was with our heads held high. Our men are now home, and South Vietnam remains free.

I believe the world is safer because Richard Nixon was our President. Who else could have established a link with Red China and in the same year begun détente with the Soviet Union? He walked us on a tight rope to peace in the Middle East.

Richard Nixon has for many years spoken the language of the majority of Americans. He believed in a strong America, yet he distrusted the Federal bureaucracy. He believed the Federal government should return power to the states and to the people.

Shakespeare said that: “Roses have thorns; silver fountains have mud; and all men make mistakes.”

Richard Nixon was subject to human frailty; and like all men, he made mistakes. He was wrong, and he is paying a severe price. But let us never forget that he was a patriot—a man who loved America.

I hope the nation, the press, and the government will now put Watergate behind us.

I have great confidence in Vice-President Gerald Ford; and with the many problems facing America, it is imperative that he, as President, have the support of an undivided nation.

We must go forward with the business of the people—with enthusiasm and faith in the future.

I am confident Vice President Ford will bring to the presidency the moral, political, intellectual, and common sense approach to the presidency that will enable this nation to continue sound leadership of the free world.

Yes, this is a sad day, but at the end of the tunnel, we can see a ray of light—President Jerry Ford.

GRAIN RESERVES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am encouraged by the August 5 Wall Street Journal article, “Idea for Domestic, World Food Reserves Gains Increased Attention in Washington.”

As the article states, I have been pointing out for some time the need for a food reserve to protect our Nation's basic, rock-bottom needs.

The opponents have argued that any Government held reserves would automatically depress the market. They claim that the private market should hold all reserves.

In my view the private market should hold most of the reserves, as my legislation recommends. But it is in our national interest to have the Government hold some modest reserves. A reserve will also help temper the volatile market which makes it impossible for the farmer to plan with any idea as to what prices he will obtain for his crops.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMODITIES: IDEA FOR DOMESTIC, WORLD FOOD RESERVES GAINS INCREASED ATTENTION IN WASHINGTON

(By Les Gapay)

WASHINGTON.—An old idea for a system of grain reserves for use when supplies are tight is gaining more attention in government.

Various Congressmen long have called for domestic food reserves and also have urged that the U.S. take the lead in establishing an international reserve system. Only recently an advisory panel to the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs proposed such an international reserve.

Meanwhile, a Senate Agriculture subcommittee held some hearings on legislation proposed by Sen. Hubert Humphrey (D., Minn.) that would establish a system of U.S. government stocks of wheat, feed grains, cotton and soybeans to be accumulated through the Agriculture Department's loan program to farmers, and the panel will hold more meetings. One purpose would be to stabilize fluctuating prices of grains and also cattle, hogs and poultry, which depend on grains for feed. Advocates of the Humphrey plan claim that concern about high food prices and the likelihood of a disastrous corn crop this year will put continued emphasis on grain reserves and increase the measure's chances for passage.

OPPOSITION IS LESSENING

Within the Nixon administration, opposition to a world food-reserve system is lessening, although officials still oppose any U.S. government-held stocks of grain. The Agriculture and State Departments are in the midst of defining administration policy on world grain reserves in preparation for a United Nations-sponsored food conference in Rome. The conference, to be held in November, was advocated by Secretary of State Henry Kissinger.

In a recent speech, Edwin M. Martin, a former ambassador and current State Department official delegated as the “U.S. coordinator” for the world food conference, said it is “essential to agree on an international system of national food reserves” as the supply and demand for food comes into closer balance in the face of continuing population growth. He didn't give details, but Mr. Martin's view goes a step further than that espoused by Agriculture Secretary Earl

Butz, who opposes an internationally held and managed stockpile. Mr. Butz favors each nation developing its own program.

In conjunction with the food conference, State and Agriculture Department personnel are studying a revamping of Food for Peace and other U.S. food-aid programs as possible alternatives to a formal government system of grain stocks. One problem with the Food for Peace program, says an Agriculture Department official, is that amounts available for use are determined each year by what's left from production and estimated consumption of crops. Thus, the amounts available for aid vary.

Some officials, moreover, are worried that even for domestic use the difference between production and consumption is getting too close. Until recently, the U.S. had enjoyed grain surpluses. But now the stock of U.S. wheat on hand, for example, is at 217 million bushels, the lowest level since 1948 and half that of a year ago and only a fourth of the level two years ago.

POPULATION GROWTH CITED

Of course, world-wide population growth also is catching up to production growth. The Senate nutrition committee's advisory panel warned that any decline from expected levels in this year's world grain crop would cause famine in some parts of the world and suggested a system of reserves for emergency needs of developing countries. Sen. George McGovern (D., S.D.), chairman of the Senate panel, went further, suggesting that the U.S. also establish its own grain reserves isolated from the normal commercial markets.

The House passed legislation in 1972 establishing such reserves, but it was defeated in the Senate Agriculture Committee, at the urging of the Nixon administration. In 1973, a similar Senate bill was defeated as an amendment to the farm bill. Currently, the Senate Agricultural Committee is divided on the matter. But some Senators from agriculture states fear that a system of reserves would depress present prices.

Sen. Humphrey, however, says prices wouldn't drop. Frequently pointing to the biblical story of Joseph convincing the pharaohs of Egypt to store grain for lean years, the Senator says his legislation would provide for government acquisitions, through its loan program, of stocks in times of excess production. Sale of the stocks would occur only in times of short supply. The proposed legislation calls for stocks of 200 million bushels of wheat, 15 million tons of feed grains (mostly corn), 50 million bushels of soybeans and 1.5 million bales of cotton.

Indeed, Sen. Humphrey claims that Secretary Butz's proposal of having the private grain trade, rather than the government, hold substantial volumes in reserve would depress prices and discourage further production by farmers. Farm groups are split on the proposal.

Secretary Butz in recent months frequently has said he would favor only an international sharing of information to assess supply and deficit situations and to give guidelines for nations to follow in developing their own courses of action.

Mr. Butz says he doesn't want a recurrence of the U.S. holding surpluses as a byproduct of price-support programs and that the government should stay out of the grain-storage business. "We must get over the idea that there is something evil about reasonable rises and falls in food supplies and prices," he says.

CONCENTRATION IN FOOD MARKETING

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, for many long years I have been concerned about the growth of monopoly power in this country's system for bringing food from the farm to the American dinner table.

Recently, as the result of a court case heard in California, attention has again been focused on the impact of concentrated buying and marketing power in the hands of huge national food chains. This case involves the same industry, cattle raising, which was struggling under the burden of unequal power distribution in the marketplace a full decade ago when its plight moved me to introduce legislation which became Public Law 88-354 and established the National Commission on Food Marketing.

Along with several of my colleagues, including the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HRUSKA), I had the privilege of serving as a member of the Commission through 2 years of intense investigation of this Nation's food marketing establishment.

In my brief separate statement printed as part of the Commission report in June, 1966, I observed that our studies of the subject had led to the conclusion that—

The accumulation of market power can readily lead to the oppression of both consumers and producers.

In that report, I went on to state that the National Commission on Food Marketing itself, despite 2 years of hearings, investigations and expert advice, had "barely begun to comprehend the implications arising out of the growth of the great food chains."

And I added:

I am not so concerned with the relatively few cases in which market power of the chains is deliberately employed in predatory schemes. But size inevitably begets power, and inordinate power tends to subvert the free play of market forces, of supply and demand, upon which we have traditionally relied to insure producers and consumers equity in the marketplace.

Perhaps, Mr. President, I should have been more concerned about the intentional predatory practices which the Federal court jury in San Francisco found persisted even beyond the Commission's report and its recommendations. Those included, among others, that the Federal Trade Commission should be charged with making a continuing review of market structure and competition in the food industry and report annually thereon to the Congress.

Happily, the FTC has recently moved to pick up this matter again, though we might wish that less time had passed. Other recommendations of the Commission, such as its call for a centralized consumer agency established by statute, have yet to be realized despite long and careful consideration.

Mr. President, the plaintiffs in the San Francisco lawsuit were cattle ranchers who contended, convincingly to the jury, at least, that several of this Nation's largest chains had set high non-competitive retail prices and low wholesale prices paid to packers, which in turn affected what packers paid to the ranchers.

The contention is that the practices alleged, including geographical allocation of territories, centralized buying and coordination of efforts to control supply—in short, the failure to compete on

price—unfairly punish the producer and the consumer.

The statement I appended to the report of the National Commission in 1966 observed that—

The central role in our food distribution system is occupied by food retailing. Over the past several decades the balance of power has increasingly shifted to retailers at the expense of farmers, processors, and consumers.

While distressed that we have not made more headway on putting stress on the public interest considerations involved in this vitally important area of everyone's life, it is a healthy thing that civil processes initiated by concerned citizens have brought the question to the fore again. I realize that the judgment and award in the case involving the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co., has not been fixed irrevocably. Still, Mr. President, the case is important, for it points again to the need for sustained attention to this national problem, not just by judicial proceedings, but also by the executive and by the legislative branches of the Government. I ask unanimous consent that two news reports, taken from the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal editions of July 26, 1974, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A. & P. IS ORDERED TO PAY DAMAGES OF \$32.7 MILLION

SAN FRANCISCO.—A federal court jury awarded actual damages amounting to \$10.9 million to six cattle ranchers who had charged Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. with conspiring to fix fresh-beef prices.

Under antitrust laws, actual-damage awards are tripled by the federal court, making the total damage against A&P \$32.7 million.

A&P's attorney, Arthur Dunne, moved for a new trial or for the court to overturn the six-person jury's verdict. A hearing is set for Aug. 20. Mr. Dunne said that if he loses his motions, the company will appeal.

In New York, an A&P spokesman said "The verdict is shocking and we are confident we will be vindicated."

Joseph M. Alioto, attorney for the plaintiffs and son of San Francisco's Mayor Joseph L. Alioto, said he will seek on Aug. 20 to have the court order that the case be made a class action so that other ranchers affected in a manner similar to the plaintiffs might seek damages against A&P.

The four California and two Colorado ranchers had originally filed suit in 1968 against A&P, Safeway Stores Inc. and Kroger Co., but both Safeway and Kroger settled out of court last year for a total of \$85,000 without admitting that they conspired to fix fresh-beef prices. The plaintiffs had sought almost the exact amount awarded them by the jury.

Plaintiffs had contended that A&P had set high noncompetitive retail prices and low wholesale prices paid to packers, which in turn affected what packers paid to the ranchers.

A. & P. HELD GUILTY ON MEAT PRICING

SAN FRANCISCO, July 25.—A Federal jury found the A. & P. supermarket chain guilty today of fixing prices in buying fresh meat and assessed the giant company a total of \$32,712,081 in damages. The Great Atlantic and Pacific Tea Company was found guilty of conspiring to fix prices at both the wholesale and retail levels.

The plaintiffs had alleged that A. & P. conspired with a number of members of the National Association of Food Chains to fix high, noncompetitive retail prices and low wholesale prices for meats.

An A. & P. spokesman at its New York headquarters said of the judgment: "The verdict is shocking. We are innocent and we are confident we will be vindicated." A. & P. is expected to ask for a retrial at a hearing set for Aug. 20.

AUTOMATICALLY TRIPLIED

The award was won by six ranchers and livestock producers in California and Colorado who were represented by Joseph M. Alloto, son of San Francisco's Mayor, Joseph L. Alloto. The actual damages awarded by the jury totaled \$10,904,027, which is automatically tripled under antitrust law.

The complainants filed suit in 1968 alleging that A. & P. conspired to restrain trade in fresh meat by "allocating geographical territories to preclude competition." The ranchers had asserted that the giant retailer and others had eliminated competition by centralizing buying and exchanging information, coordinating efforts to control supply and providing sales and profit information to their trade associations.

Safeway Stores, Inc., and the Kroger Company, also large food retailers, were dismissed as defendants in 1972 and 1973 by Chief United States District Court Judge Oliver J. Carter after stipulating to agreements by which \$90,000 was paid to cover attorney fees.

AWARDS ARE LISTED

The jury awarded \$25,058,277 to Dan Compton of Woodbridge, Calif., \$5,708,958 to Irvin Bray of King City, Calif., \$914,673 to Arnold Christensen of Arbuckle, Calif., \$552,981 to Stanley and Orin Vanleck of Slough House, Calif., \$240,849 to William Prather of DeBeque, Colo., and \$236,334 to R. E. Boulton & Sons of Newcastle, Colo.

The complaint alleged that the antitrust violations occurred from 1964 to February, 1973. The jury awarded damages for the period from 1964 to January, 1968, the date of the suit. Mr. Alloto estimated that, in this period, his plaintiffs had sold 51 million to 52 million pounds of beef and had sought damages of 10 to 20 cents a pound for losses that occurred as a result of the action by major food stores.

A pretrial order named as alleged co-conspirators—but not defendants—seven other chain store groups, Winn-Dixie Stores, First National Stores, Colonial Stores, Giant Food, Food Fair Stores, the Brenner Tea Company and the Jewel Tea Company.

Mr. Alloto said initial financing for the suit came from various stock growers' groups in Colorado, South Dakota, Wyoming and Montana. He added that he would file a motion to make the complaint a class action at the Aug. 20 hearing.

WHATEVER HAPPENED TO THE ENERGY CRISIS?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I want to commend to my colleagues an excellent recent CBS News special entitled: "What Ever Happened to the Energy Crisis?" The broadcast made three important generalizations which we must keep in mind when considering energy legislation in the near future. First, the hard times of last winter were not the energy crisis. Second, we are more at the mercy of the Arabs now than before their embargo and the next energy drought could be worse. Third, this country's leadership is not leading us out of this continuing energy crisis and something has to be done quickly.

The documentary points out that energy conservation is a key factor in solving our long-term energy problems in the United States, but we are back to our old ways of consuming too much energy. CBS points out that motorists are not obeying the national speed limit of 55 miles an hour. People are back to buying the big gas-guzzling automobiles even though they are paying more than 60 cents a gallon for gasoline.

CBS also shows that Americans waste energy through our inefficient heating, cooling, and lighting systems for residential and commercial buildings:

More than twenty percent of all the energy consumed in the United States is used simply to heat or cool residential and commercial buildings because most such structures are overcooled in summer and overheated in winter, the amount of energy wasted each year is staggering. Compounding the overkill in space conditioning—that's heating and cooling—is a general, excessive use of electric lighting and an insufficient use of building insulation material.

Commentator John Hart makes a very interesting observation about the impact of the "energy crisis" upon the major oil corporations:

We've been through a convulsion without having passed the crisis and we are still addicted to oil. What are the oil companies doing? They're making a lot of money, for one thing.

Here's how ten of the big companies have done in the first half of this year, compared to the first half of last year:

Exxon: more than a billion and a half dollars of profit, up over fifty percent.

Texaco: over a billion dollars profit through June, up more than ninety-seven percent.

Gulf: more than half a billion, up fifty percent.

Mobil: approaching two-thirds of a billion, up eighty-four percent.

Standard of Indiana: nearly half a billion, up a hundred and six percent.

Shell: nearly a quarter billion, up forty-five percent.

Phillips: more than two hundred million, up a hundred and twenty-eight percent.

Continental: more than two hundred million, up one hundred and eleven percent.

Atlantic Richfield: two hundred and thirty three million, up ninety-seven percent.

Sun Oil two hundred and eighteen million, up one hundred twenty-four percent.

Over five billion dollars of profits for ten oil companies in six months. They are spending some of it looking for new oil. But they say they need two things to make the turn toward independence in energy: clearer leadership in Washington, and more high profits.

CBS points out that we have had little effective response from the administration and the industry to the energy crisis and that it will get worse before it gets better unless we do something now.

Unfortunately, the decisive changes in our conservation programs and in the development of new sources of energy are still pending. John Hart summarizes the special report by stating:

Conservation is voluntary. And we are voluntarily abandoning it. The development of alternative sources is incidental to the development of more oil. The pain of the crisis is in remission. But the condition of the crisis remain. Industry blames environmentalists and the government. The government we haven't heard from lately. That is what happened to the energy crisis.

Mr. President, in light of this excellent documentary and the pending long term energy crisis, I urge my colleagues to support several important energy proposals which the Senate will be considering in the next two weeks.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this report be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CBS NEWS SPECIAL REPORT—WHATEVER HAPPENED TO THE ENERGY CRISIS?

ANNOUNCER. Because of the following Special Program CBS News Retrospective will not be presented this evening.

JOHN HART. Good evening. It's probably not necessary to mention that these are times of crisis, when we're bending the future in new directions for better or for worse. We have a political crisis, an economic crisis, some people might add, an energy crisis. A good deal has happened in the six months since Dr. Kissinger accused the Arab oil countries of blackmail. One thing that's happened is that we've been making large payments to them. It's been four months since they turned the oil back on. Another thing that's happened is that the long lines of winter, waiting for gasoline have turned into the long lines of summer burning gasoline as if there's a surplus—which there is. It seems hardly the time to bring it up: What-
ever Happened To The Energy Crisis? But it is time. As we shall see.

ANNOUNCER. This is a CBS News Special Report: Whatever Happened To The Energy Crisis? With Correspondent John Hart.

HART. We begin this broadcast with our conclusions: There are three. The first one is that the hard times of last winter were not the energy crisis. They were the miseries of a crisis that was there before and is still here now. The second is that we are more at the mercy of the Arabs now than before their embargo and that the next energy drought could be worse. The third conclusion is that this country's leadership is not leading us out of this continuing energy crisis. And in this hour you'll have a chance to argue with these conclusions as we show you what led us to them.

The energy crisis, together with the inflation it is feeding has already changed history. It has forced rich nations to beg. It has forced powerful ones into new alliances. It forced aspiring ones to abandon some dreams. Most of us don't notice all this, mainly because we can buy gas and oil again. Tonight, we'll take care to notice what has changed.

On the road, where we learned last winter how to use gasoline better. In Detroit which has decided in its 1975 models whether we really want better mileage. In our buildings where much of our energy is used and wasted. In the energy industry where riches were made in addition to promises. In government where promises were made. And in the rest of the world where whole economies are on a slippery side.

The Arabs turned the oil back on four months ago. The lines have gone from the filling stations and they're back on the road. Harry Drinkwater reports.

HARRY DRINKWATER. To most, seeking vacation spots this summer, the recent gasoline shortage is as distant a memory as World War Two. Places like Disneyland report that not even the high cost per gallon is keeping motorists away. A year ago the average price of gas was thirty-nine cents a gallon. Now, it's fifty-five cents, an increase of sixteen cents a gallon. National parks are booked solid, thirty-six million American families are crowding the highways, hotels and campsites, the same number of vacationers as last year.

One man at Yosemite seemed to sum it all up.

MAN AT YOSEMITE. Well, it'd been January or February I wouldn't have then come to Yosemite. But I'm from San Diego and so there didn't seem any problem now so I've got the money, I come.

DRINKWATER. The national speed limit is still fifty-five miles an hour; drive slower to get better fuel economy the law says, but are motorists obeying?

MAN. I would say that California motorists are doing exactly what the motorists in the rest of the nation are doing and that is violating the fifty-five speed limit in unprecedented numbers. A recent survey by the California Department of Transportation, an independent organization from the Highway Patrol indicates that four out of every five vehicles are violating the fifty-five mile speed limit.

DRINKWATER. On a weekend, say, how many people does that mean who are going faster than fifty-five? How many tickets could you write?

MAN. Well, theoretically, we feel that we could write a hundred thousand citations a day in California if we had the manpower; they find themselves speeding although they say they like the fifty-five speed limit.

DRINKWATER. A Gallup Poll found, in fact, that seventy-two percent say they favor the fifty-five mile an hour limit. Another poll and hard economics indicated the mobile home and recreational vehicle industry was in deep trouble earlier this year, some firms going bankrupt.

But that is changing now too. People are buying them again, sales so brisk some manufacturers can't make them fast enough to keep up with the demand.

Energy Office warnings be damned many Americans seem to be saying. We like the big gas guzzlers. We like to drive fast and we'll pay sixty cents a gallon. It's worth it even if it means we can't afford steaks when we finally park at the campsite and light the old barbecue.

HART. For a while sixty cent gas seemed to mean we couldn't afford big cars. Small cars took over the market in January.

Fifty-five percent of it. Now down to about forty-five percent. A lot of people stopped buying new cars altogether. Now the 1975 models are about to appear and we'll see how Detroit is coping as Richard Roth reports.

RICHARD ROTH. Assembly lines now finishing the 1974 model run will soon begin turning out cars most of us haven't even heard of. Cars with names like Pacer and Skyhawk, the 1975 cars that will be Detroit's first tentative answer to the energy problem. Tentative because not all auto executives are sure how much energy problems have really changed Americans' buying habits.

MAN. We still feel, for instance, that there's going to be—always going to be a market in the United States for a vehicle that will carry the husband, wife, three kiddies, a dog, a trunkful of luggage on their vacation. And this doesn't have to be a large car necessarily and it doesn't necessarily have poor fuel economy.

ROTH. Five or six months ago the sign in a suburban Detroit showroom held the kind of promise car buyers were looking for. Today salesman Terry Christian says almost no one is asking for twenty-nine miles to the gallon.

TERRY CHRISTIAN. Right now our public wants the large cars. They're not really interested in the economy. They're more interested in the convenience of the large cars. They're worried next year about the engines that are coming out. So we've got our big car back out.

ROTH. Whatever happened to the energy crisis?

CHRISTIAN. I don't really think people after the first impact of the first six weeks, they

really had it in their mind anymore. They really think the energy crisis was a hoax and none of us really knows the real truth, whether it was or wasn't.

ROTH. Big cars with big gasoline appetites are selling again. But automakers, generally, are convinced last winter's gasoline lines speeded up a trend automotive designers have been working with for several years, the trend to the small car. Even big car leader General Motors will introduce five new small cars modeled on its highly successful Vega this year, four more than had been planned before the oil embargo.

The problem is, the new small cars may be developing some of the big car's extravagant habits.

Ford is naming these 1975 cars the Granada and Monarch. They're smaller and lighter than standard or intermediate size but too big to be called compact. Basic models with six cylinder engines will save some gas but the people at Ford expect many buyers will want the bigger engine and the options that offer luxury at the expense of fuel economy.

A Ford executive says: For 1975, small will be in. Austerity will be out.

And that may include austerity at the gas pump.

HART. To say nothing of austerity at home where the energy waste begins.

It's harder to turn in a big, inefficient building for a new model than it is a car. And Richard Wagner reports, it's harder to get people interested too.

RICHARD WAGNER. More than twenty percent of all the energy consumed in the United States is used simply to heat or cool residential and commercial buildings because most such structures are overcooled in summer and overheated in winter, the amount of energy wasted each year is staggering. Compounding the overkill in space conditioning, that's heating and cooling is a general, excessive use of electric lighting and an insufficient use of building insulation material. This report focuses on what is being done about the problem in Phoenix, Arizona.

The largest office building in the southwestern United States is the Valley Bank Building in downtown Phoenix. It's forty stories tall and was opened last year, just before the energy crunch hit. Of all the energy consumed in a building of this kind, almost half goes for lighting. Now, the building's management has found that to conserve energy, it can cut the number of fluorescent tubes in each fixture in half without reducing lighting efficiency. A computer system is currently being installed which will allow one man to monitor the entire building's interior climate. Thousands of sensors will report temperature changes throughout the structure's safe conditioning system and the computer will make the needed corrections. The double pane reflective skin of the building can reduce by up to eighty-five percent the heat from the sun which would otherwise enter the building, thereby reducing considerably the amount of air conditioning required. The battery of decorative lights has never been used and is not likely to be in the foreseeable future.

With regard to residences, the main concern in this part of the country is cooling, not heating. Only five percent of new homes in the United States were air conditioned ten years ago. Now, fifty percent are. One developer in this area is in the process of building energy conscious, two to four bedroom homes which will sell for twenty-three to thirty thousand dollars. The homes are available with windmills to generate electricity and a set of storage batteries to hold it ready for use; an eight hour charge can provide up to three days of power. The system will add five thousand dollars to the price of the house.

Less expensive energy savers are wind tur-

bines to pull hot air which can reach two hundred degrees out of attics and evaporative coolers to provide cool air at one tenth the energy consumption of refrigeration type space conditioning units.

Ten inch thick walls are standard to keep the cool air in and the hot air out. Solar heaters provide hot water and a rooftop tank keeps it hot. In Phoenix's sunny weather, a system like this can supply up to ninety percent of needed hot water, water that is still steaming hot in the morning without adding to the utility bill.

Even with the energy saving features however, and perhaps because of them, prospective buyers are not standing in line to buy Frank Bragiotti's houses.

FRANK BRAGIOTTI. I think, so far, the normal reluctance to buying anything that doesn't have a major brand name that you're accustomed with has been a hinderance to us. Secondly, I think we tend to be creatures of habit. And we're used to paying for energy and it's a little different when we get our hot water for free from the sun or electricity free from the wind. This is something different than we're used to.

WAGNER. Are you having a problem educating the purchaser? Does he believe you?

BRAGIOTTI. I think right now in 1974, it's difficult to educate the consumer, people tend to be quite a bit like the man from Missouri: show me. Prove it.

WAGNER. Despite the need to conserve energy, what Americans are looking for in their new homes is more of what they were getting before there ever was an energy crisis.

HART. This crisis is like arsenic in your coffee. It's a bit more bitter than before, what with higher prices and all. But you get used to it and all the time the poison is building up in your system. In fact, we are more dependent on the Arabs now than before the embargo.

The bottom line is our domestic oil production. It is going down. The top line is our oil consumption. It is going up. Last year, we imported two point three billion barrels. This year we're going to import around a hundred million barrels more than that. One reason this is happening is the stalemate in government. The Congress and the White House unable to agree on what to do about it.

Roger Mudd reports on the Congress. Dan Rather on the White House.

ROGER MUDD. Six months ago the energy crisis was it on Capitol Hill. It was everybody's favorite and easy issue. Everybody talked about it, played politics about it, postured about it, drafted legislation about it. By one count, close to eight hundred bills touching on the energy crisis were introduced. But as it turns out what Congress really did was blow a lot of steam. Only eight energy bills are now law. The rights of way through federal lands, that's the Alaska Pipeline Bill which had been around for more than a year. Two, oil allocation, giving the President mandatory control over oil distribution. Three, FDA, the Federal Energy Agency, the first Nixon request to pass. Four, daylight saving time, an experiment until April of next year. Five, economic stabilization to promote competition in the oil industry. Six, Uranium Corporation to sell uranium to America's European atomic partners. Seven, highway conservation—fifty-five miles an hour on federal roads. And, eight, energy supply, temporary suspension of some air pollution laws in the name of energy saving.

But not passed is a seemingly endless list, part of it duplicated here. A national land use bill, a deepwater port bill, a coal conversion bill, an oil price rollback bill, a gasoline rationing bill and so on.

When the Congress returned from its Christmas recess, the members were filled with voters' complaints about the fuel shortage and the rising price of gas. The Congress

took it out on the oil company executives who got roasted regularly for resisting price rollbacks and for opposing a tightening of tax loopholes. But in the end the Congress backed off, preferring to believe apparently President Nixon's declaration in February that the energy crisis was over.

Senator Henry Jackson of Washington professed he wasn't sure how Congress could again be stimulated to act.

Senator HENRY JACKSON. It's tough. It's tough, Roger, very tough. For example, people are concerned about the price, but when my bill was up and it passed, two to one, to roll back the price, in the middle of the crisis, as the situation was being eased, the President vetoed the bill; we lost the override, two-thirds vote by eight votes in the Senate. Just because they could see the crisis coming to an end. And the oil industry was able to really lobby so that they turned Senators around who had voted for us.

MURD. But then when the crunch was on, the Congress couldn't summon enough votes to override.

JACKSON. That's right. We lost by eight votes.

MURD. So you really didn't respond, then, did you?

JACKSON. Well, we responded but we—

MURD. Not when you had to.

JACKSON. Well, we responded but we Democrats don't have two-thirds of the votes in the Senate.

MURD. Senator, given the new attitude you perceived in the Congress last winter, are you now disappointed at the record that Congress put together on energy?

JACKSON. I'm disappointed in the attitude in the Congress. We had a good record while the crisis was on and we did a good job. The President vetoed that—those accomplishments by the action that he had taken but I am disappointed in all candor with the fact that there is a sort of *laissez faire* attitude, let's don't do anything now, it's coming along all right because they can get the gas at the pump and it's hard for the—to legislate.

DAN RATHER. This is Dan Rather. For whatever has not been done that can be done by government to solve the energy crunch, Congress is to blame. This has been a consistent theme of President Nixon and his aides for months. Mr. Nixon and his advisors claim that as they put it, the President's decisive action in solving short run aspects of the energy problem represent major accomplishments for which Mr. Nixon should receive a great deal of credit. And that if Congress will spend less time now on Watergate and more time on legislation proposed by the President, the country will be well on its way to solving energy problems for the foreseeable future.

When the energy crisis was in the headlines every day, the President met often with William Simon, then his chief energy advisor. During the past few months, with the energy situation less in the headlines and Simon moved over to the job of Treasury Secretary, Mr. Nixon has spent comparatively little time talking with anyone about energy. His staff insists that he has spent more time than it might appear to an outsider and besides, they say, this President is good at organization, at delegating authority. Mr. Nixon, they claim, has organized the executive branch to deal effectively with the problem and has good people under him doing a good job everywhere. So if the energy problem isn't solved in the White House view, Congress, not the President will be to blame.

HART. The hard times of last winter, as hard times seem to do brought forth a new government agency, the Federal Energy Administration. It has preached conservation to the public, argued for better mileage with the car makers, taken control of gasoline prices and on Capitol Hill generally opposed the tax and conservation bills that industry

opposed. The Energy Office has worked more at reducing demand than at increasing production. Nelson Benton talked with Energy Czar John Sawhill about that.

JOHN SAWHILL. Well, we have asked the Congress to provide us with a mandatory labeling bill so that the American consumer would know exactly what he's getting when he buys an appliance or buys an automobile. One way I think that would help American buyers understand the efficiency of automobiles is if we said this car gets twenty miles per gallon but if you get air conditioning it will only get eighteen miles per gallon. If you get automatic transmission, it will only get sixteen miles per gallon.

NELSON BENTON. Mr. Sawhill, there's an estimate now that there's something like one and a half to two million barrels per day oil surplus in the world. When is this surplus likely to show up in the substantial reduction of prices at the retail level?

SAWHILL. I don't think the reduction will be substantial, although I think we will see some softening in price, provided that the Middle Eastern nations don't begin cutting back their production in order to remove the surplus.

BENTON. Some critics say that Project Independence leans too heavily on supply considerations with a lack of emphasis on conservation. Is this a valid criticism of the way it's shaping up?

SAWHILL. I've heard that criticism but I don't quite understand it because for the next three or four years there's very little we can do on the supply side. Most of our actions are going to have to be directed at cutting back demand and all the things that we've tried to do from abandoning neckties this summer to save energy which is symbolic in a sense of the kind of lifestyle changes that Americans will have to make to meetings with automobile industry to get them to make more energy efficient cars to our meetings with homebuilders talking with them about building and retrofitting existing homes in a more energy-efficient way.

BENTON. I've heard figures of anywhere from two hundred thirty-five billion to a trillion dollars for the cost of Project Independence. Where does all that money come from?

SAWHILL. Well, it's going to have to come from other sectors in the economy. We're going to have to reorder our priorities in order to shift resources away from things we've been doing in the past to expanding our energy supply if we want to maintain the kind of economic growth we've had in the past in this country.

BENTON. The government's going to have to foot a lot of the bill, will it not?

SAWHILL. The government will have to spend substantial sums. But a great deal of it is going to be spent by private industry and this is why we keep saying that energy prices are going to go up. They're going to have to go up in order to require the increased production of energy in this country.

HART. The thing is our priorities have not been reordered. Our habits are not being changed by choice or by force. The cost of energy has gone up dramatically but the production of energy in this country has not. Project Independence is a joke in certain oil circles. One big executive laughed at the mention of it, saying his Arab partners laughed too. This year we moved away from Independence, not toward it.

George Herman looked at the American energy industry to find out why.

GEORGE HERMAN. America's energy crisis started in 1956 when drilling for oil hit its peak and started down. Oil production from American field peaked in 1970 and it started down in turn. And that sparked the beginning or more drilling belatedly. In 1970 we had to import twenty-three percent of our oil. Now it's up over thirty-six percent.

In this weakened condition we suffered heavily from the Arab oil embargo and called it a crisis. Now the Arabs have turned on the oil again and that crisis is over but the whole oil picture has changed. Oil now costs from two to four times as much. Gasoline is up fifteen cents a gallon and we're using less of both.

This summer American gasoline consumption, instead of rising its usual three or four percent decreased fractionally. And with rising imports we have an increased reserve stock of gasoline and a feeling that there's a comfortable supply. We're out of the crunch because we are importing more, using less and paying more for it.

What we'd like, of course, is more American oil and less importing. And there is more American oil. Geologists say we've found only about half of it. On the average we pump out only about a third of what we find. The other two-thirds stays in the ground, too difficult and too expensive to get out. Now the vastly higher price of oil has made that two-thirds more interesting and some oil companies have ordered new equipment to get out the remainder. That will take two or three years and it will be a decade before any significant part of that sound but formerly uneconomic oil is flowing.

New drilling is increasing but there's a catch. Drill pipe and drill rig steel are scarce. Some have shown up on a sort of driller's black market. And finally, oil companies say it's hard to know what to do while you're waiting for leadership from the administration and worrying about when Congress will slap you with new taxes and environmental restrictions.

The net result of it all is that our dependence on foreign oil has continued to increase.

Natural gas is usually found in drilling for oil. Gas is distributed through long and costly pipelines like oil and the conventional wisdom is that twenty years of government price regulation has discouraged gas companies from exploring and drilling. So last month the Federal Power Commission granted significant price increases for new gas. One major company, Phillips Petroleum says the new increases are not enough to stimulate new searches and new gas production. No new bonanzas have been reported. Domestic reserves of gas are declining and the expectation is that natural gas will have to be imported or else supplanted by gas made from coal and the progress on that has not been accelerated by the energy crisis.

Coal was supposed to be our big fallback position. We have more energy in American coal than Saudi Arabia has in oil, enough to fuel America for centuries. Government officials talked bravely of tripling our production of coal by 1985. What was actually done?

MAN. There was a time during the embargo, during the heyday prices when all the political rhetoric, and all of the policy decisions that were about to be made and the legislation all were headed in the direction of a total national commitment to the development of coal, much like Project, the Manhattan Project or the space program. It looked as though this is the direction we're going as a nation. And when the spigot was turned back on,

HERMAN. The oil spigot?

MAN. The oil spigot was turned back on, somehow this was lost sight of. And from the failure of that basic commitment to the development of coal as our most abundant, indigenous resource, came what happened and that was essentially—nothing.

HERMAN. Three days ago something did happen. The House overwhelmingly passed a tough bill to regulate strip mining and protect the environment. The industry had bitterly opposed the bill saying it would devastate strip mine production and destroy any chance that coal could play a big role in

solving this nation's energy problem. If House and Senate agree on such a measure, Baggie(?) says he recommends a veto. But the margin in the House, anyway, was more than needed to override a veto.

The coal situation is further complicated by labor problems. It's widely anticipated that in November the miners will walk out for what could be a prolonged strike, creating major problems for energy supplies this winter. The union says it's in a strong position.

MAN. Well, one thing they always tried to do when contract negotiations got down to where they were about ready to begin, they always maintained build up huge reserve stockpiles and they don't have any stockpiles now. There's shortage everywhere you go and they're not in that position. If we're forced into a position where there is a strike, it could be a rough one.

HERMAN. Their quality standards may or may not allow coal to be burned in factories and by electric utilities. Coal is a utility, the biggest single source of power and they need more and more of it if they are allowed to burn it or if techniques can be perfected to remove the noxious sulfur before or after the coal is burned. In the meantime, coal is in a holding pattern; production up less than seven percent; no signs of any rush to open new coal mines.

Nuclear power plants have turned out to be a complicated and dangerous way to boil water for a turbine; big new nuclear plants last year ran at about fifty-eight percent of their rate of capacity while big new fossil plants were turning out seventy-five percent of theirs. The energy crisis was far too short-lived to affect anything so long range as the nuclear power program. If anything, plans for nuclear plants have decreased recently. First, because power companies are in desperate financial straits and will need help to survive, let alone buy nuclear plants and also because of a projection that uranium will be in short supply in ten to fifteen years and may have to be imported.

HART. We've been through a convulsion without having passed the crisis and we are still addicted to oil. What are the oil companies doing? They're making a lot of money, for one thing.

Here's how ten of the big companies have done in the first half of this year, compared to the first half of last year:

Exxon more than a billion and a half dollars of profit up over fifty percent.

Texaco over a billion dollars profit through June up more than ninety-seven percent.

Gulf more than half a billion up fifty percent.

Mobil approaching two-thirds of a billion up eighty-four percent.

Standard of Indiana nearly half a billion up a hundred and six percent.

Shell nearly a quarter billion up forty-five percent.

Phillips more than two hundred million up a hundred and twenty-eight percent.

Continental more than two hundred million up one hundred and eleven percent.

Atlantic Richfield two hundred and thirty-three million up ninety-seven percent.

Sun Oil two hundred and eighteen million, up one hundred twenty-four percent.

Over five billion dollars of profits for ten oil companies in six months. They are spending some of it looking for new oil. But they say they need two things to make the turn toward independence in energy: clearer leadership in Washington and more high profits.

HART. The Ford Foundation studied energy for two years and this spring reported that no single villain brought us to this point and no simple action will get us out.

The Report said that unless we can increase our imports of oil at an acceptable economic and political price, the only thing we can do right away is simply use less. The director of the study was S. David Freeman.

S. DAVID FREEMAN. The surest road to independence, or interdependence, whichever you want to call it is energy conservation. The way to cut down imports is to cut down on the gasoline that we burn on the highways. We will not get there by excavating Colorado in my judgment because I don't think the people out there have yet decided that they want to be excavated.

HART. From all you can see, there is no crisis. Where is the crisis?

FREEMAN. Well, the crisis is still right around the corner. But what has happened is that we're really all a year older and just deeper in debt. I think that we had a wonderful opportunity at the end of the embargo for the President to move ahead in a policy of true energy conservation. He blew it and I think the country is blowing it. And yet the opportunity was there for leadership to put together a package of legislation that would require homes to be insulated that would give poor people the money to insulate their houses, that would require Detroit to keep on refueling and not stop the minute the crisis was over and that would put an end to this ridiculous situation of discount rates to big industries for electric power when the more they use the more it costs the average consumer. We have the ingredients of a consumer-owner energy possibly that's just literally staring us in the face but we have government that seems to be indifferent to the public interest and I must say that the media left just about as soon as the gas lines disappeared.

HART. How are you going to get action before the day of reckoning that you talk about?

FREEMAN. We've got to talk straight to the American people and persuade them that this wasn't just cooked up in a hotel room by the oil companies. Sure, they're making money hand over fist and their profits are way too high and all that but that's not the heart of the problem. The heart of the problem is that we're living way beyond our budget in terms of the resources that are environmentally available.

HART. Conservation isn't everything, is it? You also have to think about supply.

FREEMAN. Well, of course, we have to have supplies but the greatest help in our supply situation would be if we could buy enough time through conservation to develop new sources that are cleaner and give the existing sources enough breathing room to—for us to be able to clean them up.

HART. The easiest source of energy to get at is still oil and the oil companies are still spending most of their efforts and profits on getting it. Freeman and the Ford Foundation say the thing to do first is conserve, reduce demand.

William Tavalierius, president of Mobil says that's only half of it.

WILLIAM TAVALERIUS. The problem I see today is that nothing is being done about creating additional supplies, with the entire emphasis on slowing demand. In terms of lesser demand brought about by conservation and higher prices that's understandable but the other side of the equation is increased supplies. Nothing is really being done about increased supplies. The next crisis, in my opinion, is going to be much worse than what we saw in the past.

HART. Do you know when it's coming?

TAVALERIUS. Well, I don't think anyone knows when it's coming because involved are many factors. But if you asked me to guess, I would say that if we have a cold winter, very cold winter, we could have some shortages again this winter. But within two years in my opinion, we'll be back into another very serious crisis. And maybe before that.

HART. And will that be a temporary crisis or will it be more likely to be more permanent than the last one?

TAVALERIUS. Well, if we don't increase supplies, it'll be more permanent.

HART. Isn't that your job?

TAVALERIUS. Yes. It is my job and I—the trouble is I get too much help and the help just impedes me doing my job.

For example, I, right now, am planning to expand and modernize a refinery in Pauls-ville(?) New Jersey. In order to get that refinery approved, I need certain environmental clearances. I was told I would have those clearances by this summer. Now I'm told I'm lucky if I get it in the first part of 1975. In the meantime, we're spending money and by the first part of 1975 Mobil will have exposed(?) eighty million dollars, not knowing whether we can get that refinery modernized and built.

HART. What about exploration in this country, given the object of, you know, independence?

TAVALERIUS. Well, all we got in the United States is the Lower 48 which has been really explored. And the offshore area. And Alaska. The offshore areas and Alaska is completely under governmental control. They're just not seeing fit to put up some of these areas. So we're opportunity limited in the United States.

HART. Mr. Tavalierius, whatever happened to Senator Jackson?

TAVALERIUS. You'd better ask Senator Jackson that question. Maybe you should have asked me what I think should be happening to Senator Jackson.

HART. Seriously.

TAVALERIUS. Well, let's analyze the situation. We had a crisis. People were disturbed. They had a right to be disturbed. I'm working in the oil industry so I feel defensive to an extent and I say, they wanted to find a whipping boy and blame somebody. My problem is I don't see any additional barrels of reserves coming out of all these investigations. [GARBLED]... needs additional barrels of reserves in the United States. That's how they're going to avoid an energy crisis.

HART. The fact is the United States and much of the developed world is in hock to Arab reserves. So energy policy is now fundamental to foreign policy.

Armand Kalb(?) asked Secretary of State Kissinger if the developed nations are mature enough to handle the problem.

Secretary of State KISSINGER. Well, when it started out, the first reaction of course was every man for himself. I think most nations, indeed, I would say all nations have now learned that this simply will not work. And short of a really new monumental crisis we are well underway towards making progress.

KALB. Mr. Secretary, if the United States continues to use fuel at current rates, don't you face the probability that at some point down the road, we're all going to be in a fight for a limited amount of power?

KISSINGER. It is an absolute requirement that we develop new energy sources, that we conserve existing sources. If we all rely on existing sources, then in fact, there is going to be an extremely—terrific competition.

HART. There are some nations whose current problem is simply getting to the end of this decade. A look at them when we come back.

HART. The new power of Arab oil has changed international politics. The United States which has a lot of its own oil is competing with some countries that don't have any for Arab supplies.

Secretary of State Kissinger says the world must develop new sources of energy, otherwise, he says, there will be an extremely divisive competition. That could happen between the United States and Japan as both countries committed to growth compete for the limited foreign oil essential to growth, even survival.

Bruce Dunning reports from Japan.

BRUCE DUNNING. Japan's oil backlog is now full, to its pre-crisis sixty day capacity and the oil industry is rushing to increase that capacity to ninety days in order to have a thicker cushion against any future threats to the oil supply. Japan's tankers are its lifeline. This country must import virtually all its oil and Japan is the world's second greatest oil consumer. While crude oil was cheap and fuel, Japan allowed itself to become more dependent on oil than any other industrialized nation.

Nearly three-quarters of Japan's energy comes directly or indirectly from oil. Low cost oil fueled Japan's so-called economic miracle. When the Arab nations boosted the international price for oil Japan was trapped. The national oil bill has quadrupled in two years.

This increased cost of oil has caused international balance of payment deficits averaging more than a billion dollars a month so far this year, a serious drain on Japan's foreign reserves. Hardest hit by the increased cost of oil was basic industry like steel. Japan's factories are the chief users of energy, not the individual consumer as in the United States. So far the government has put the burden of cutting energy use on industry.

One of the worst hit industries is auto building, an industry which was a leader in Japan's postwar economic recovery. Domestic auto sales dropped drastically as soon as the oil crisis hit. For the first time ever, Japan's auto industry is building more cars for export than for domestic sales. But the increased cost of production has driven up the prices and the Japanese auto makers are finding that their cars are less and less competitive especially in the big U.S. market.

For the average Japanese consumer the most devastating effect of the oil crisis has been inflation. The cost of living is now running twenty-five percent above last year. One important effect of the energy crisis has been to force on Japan the realization that alternatives to oil must be found. The most promising alternative for the near future is nuclear energy. About seventy-five miles north of Tokyo the Japan Atomic Power Company is building a new million kilowatt nuclear powered station. Here's one of sixteen nuclear reactors under construction in Japan.

But atomic power is a touchy political issue because Japan is the only nation ever to suffer a nuclear attack. Every time a new reactor is proposed, residents of the area try to block it.

One resource Japan does have in quantity is coal. But coal has become an environmental villain. So its use has declined. This electrical generating plant was built a few years ago to demonstrate that coal can be a good citizen. But coal's real future most likely lies in research just now getting underway, into the possibilities of turning coal into gas or oil. The search for new sources of energy is essential to the future of Japan.

MAN. Today the link to the supply of oil in long range plans, long range view, so we must make every effort to tend our industrial sector from much energy consumption to energy saving Japan without achieving this Japan cannot be expected to survive much longer as a nation.

DUNNING. The problem for Japan is that patterns of energy use cannot be changed overnight. Japan allowed itself to become too dependent on this single source of energy and now must pay a price. That price seems to be no less than the end of the Japanese economic miracle.

HART. Other countries have no miracles to lose. Zambia, for instance; it's still getting started on economic development and the high price of oil is the same for Zambia as for Japan but the miracle in its wealth is not there to pay for it. As Bert Quint reports,

BERT QUINT. It was a wild country that

David Livingstone found here a little over a century ago. The Scottish missionary was the first European to penetrate the land that today is called Zambia. In the Wangwa(?) valley in northeastern Zambia, there still are far more elephants than humans: most of the country is equally underpopulated. Those who do dwell the Langlawa River never heard of an energy crisis. Like two of every three Zambians they live outside the economy.

There are fertile areas where the rains swell the Zambezi River and turn the earth green. But most villages grow only enough for themselves. To feed the cities and towns where industry has begun to attract people away from the land, great quantities of food, even staples like rice must be imported. So too must almost everything the townsfolk have and use.

The government wants desperately to build some plants to cut down on imports and to make the land produce more and different kinds of food. But to develop agriculture, it has to clear the wilderness. It needs heavy equipment and fuel to drive it. It needs pumps to irrigate with, fertilizer, from petroleum to enrich the land. It needs vehicles to carry produce to market. It needs schools to educate children, to train adults; it needs power and money to generate it.

More than ninety percent of Zambia's foreign exchange earnings comes from one resource—copper. The world's fourth largest producer Zambia has kept itself afloat and started its development by producing and exporting this metal.

The copper companies, fifty-one percent controlled by the government, the rest by American, British, and South African interests figure it now costs them thirteen million dollars more a year for fuel to mine and refine the copper than it did before the price rise.

Zambia imports a million tons of crude oil a year. That used to cost fifty million dollars. Now it's three times as expensive.

Zambia has some coal but it's not very good. President Taound(?) of Zambia and other African leaders have gone to the Arab oil capitals to plead for discounts. We broke relations with Israel to help you, they say. Now it's your turn to help us. In Zambia's case, the break put an end to Israel experts coming here to teach Zambians modern farming methods and to sending Zambians to Israel for training on collective farms.

Like the rest of the world the Zambians are feeling the petroleum pinch. Planning and Finance Minister Alexander Chicunda.

Do you think that the Arab oil producing nations are charging your country and other African countries a fair price for oil?

ALEXANDER CHICUNDA. I think the oil producing countries as a whole are not charging, well, in general, (GARBLED) . . . and in terms of the demand for their products, from their point of view, they think that they're charging a fair price. But from my point of view it's not a fair price because it has the effect of squeezing me out of existence.

QUINT. Water power is something Zambia does have. It shares the mile wide Victoria Falls and other Zambesi River cascades with Rhodesia. While the British controlled both areas, they built a hydroelectric plant on the Rhodesian side. Now Zambia is rushing to build plants north of the river, a backstop in case Rhodesia cuts off the supply and a source of energy to diminish to the dependence on petroleum. Like other developments in the country, these plants cost a lot of money. The high price of fuel means there is that much less cash to work with.

HART. Developing countries such as Zambia are paying a triple penalty. First, they have to buy the equipment for their development from other countries and the equipment price keeps going up. Second, they have less money to buy it with because the

cost of oil to power the equipment has more than tripled. And, third, what resources they do have, such as Zambia's copper costs them more to get at because the price of equipment and energy are so much higher. So just when they're beginning to reach up, the dream of catching up is arrested.

In Italy where the dream already came true, it is being shattered. Winston Burdette reports.

WINSTON BURDETTE. Of the ten most highly industrialized countries in the world Italy is the hardest hit in the energy crisis and the most vulnerable. She is now engaged in an uncertain battle on two fronts, against surging inflation and against the threat of irretrievable bankruptcy; a country without natural resources that has been living beyond her means, her trade deficit now expanding at the rate of close to one million dollars each month. The government has now stepped in with a drastic mix of austerity measures. With the fourth price hike in a year, the Italians are now paying a dollar and seventy-six cents for a gallon of gasoline, the highest price in western Europe.

Italy has been enjoying all the goods of a mass consumer society. After oil, her biggest import bill is for meat. She imports more meat than the United States and it cost her more than two billion dollars last year. Now the government has tripled the added value tax on beefsteak, hoping to cut that bill. And a volley of higher prices on a range of staples. And a drive against populist consumption. Higher added value taxes on all luxuries. On French champagnes of which Italy disbursed more than a hundred million dollars last year. Imported whiskey for which she paid even more. Imported perfumes and cosmetics on which she spent more than half a billion dollars. Italy came late to the affluent life and now abruptly she must give it up.

But not only the extravagance must go. Jobs must go also. The government's credit squeeze almost certainly will bring a train of bankruptcies in industry; tight money will mean recession. The National Trade Union Federation rejects the austerity program and holds strikes and demonstrations against it. The payoff will come next fall and winter. Some say there will be a quarter of a million men laid off. Others say between four and six hundred thousand unemployed by Christmas. The unions are battling and angry. They do not believe the government's brave(?) promises to crack down on wealthy tax evaders, to cut out the fat in government, to clean out the big, wasteful, parasitic state agencies that are the chief patronage machines of the ruling parties and eat up so much of the public monies. In such crises, it's usually the average man who pays and the fat is the last to go.

On every side in Italy now, you behold colossal insolvency. A national budget deficit this year of some fourteen billion dollars is expected. The State Health Service owes five billion dollars to the hospitals. The Ministry of Posts whose postal service has disintegrated is nearly one billion dollars in the red and so is the state electric company and all the time inflation propelled by the energy crisis is coming on at an annual rate of eighteen to twenty percent, threatening to engulf the country.

This is a test of Italy's ailing political system, greater, harsher than any the country has known since Mussolini. The alarm bells have sounded in the capitals of western Europe and in Washington. The deepest concern of Italy's friends is for the future of her democratic institutions. They do not forget that she has had the power and in today's Europe still has the power to drag other countries into her own calamity.

HART. The energy crisis did not go away. By definition a crisis is an unstable state of affairs in which a decisive change is impending. Two weeks ago Kuwait threatened to

keep over a million barrels of oil off the market every day if it did not get a higher price. That is not a stable state of affairs. Saudi Arabia threatens to take over all the American in Aramco, the oil combine. That is not a stable state of affairs. American oil production in this country has gone down and we are more dependent on the Arabs than before. That is not a stable state of affairs.

As for decisive changes, we've already had one in international economics with the cash tilt toward the Arab countries. We've had one in international politics, with a power tilt toward the Arab countries.

What decisive changes are still pending? The fundamental ones of changing our sources of supply and of changing our wasteful use of energy. Those changes are not being made. Conservation is voluntary. And we are voluntarily abandoning it. The development of alternative sources is incidental to the development of more oil. The pain of the crisis is in remission. But the conditions of the crisis remain. Industry blames environmentalists and the government. Environmentalists blame industry and the government. The government we haven't heard from lately. That is what happened to the energy crisis.

I'm John Hart. Good night.

THE DEFINITION OF GENOCIDE

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, genocide is commonly defined as "the systematic, planned annihilation of a racial or cultural group." There are basically two elements of this definition essential to a clear understanding of the Genocide Convention. The first of these is the term "planned," or in the words of the convention itself, "intent to destroy." Some critics of the convention allege that any act against a national, ethnic, racial or religious group would constitute genocide. They maintain that such acts as school busing and certain police and military actions would fall under the jurisdiction of this treaty. This is not so. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee clarified this matter when it attached an understanding to the treaty stating that acts of genocide are those committed with the intent to destroy, in whole or in part any of the above defined groups.

A second vital element of this definition is the concept of the "group." The Genocide Convention defines the idea as "a national, ethnical, racial, or religious group." Some critics of the Genocide Treaty claim that its ratification will place individuals accused of homicide under its jurisdiction. Nothing could be further from the truth. Homicide involves a single individual, is a domestic matter, and falls under the jurisdiction of domestic laws. Genocide involves an entire group, is a matter of international concern, and should be condemned by international law.

Genocide then must concern an entire group, and must involve the intent to destroy that group. It is a very specific crime which demands very specific legislation. In urging the speedy ratification of the Genocide Convention I call to the attention of my colleagues the words of Arthur Goldberg:

The Genocide Convention outlaws action that is repugnant to the American people. . . . It is inconceivable that we should hesitate any longer in making an international commitment against mass murder.

INCREASE THE DOMESTIC SUPPLY OF NATURAL GAS

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, we have a crucial domestic shortage of natural gas. The answer to the problem is simple—increase the domestic supply of natural gas.

Some, as I, say the only way consistent with our principles of free enterprise is deregulation.

Others disagree.

I recommend this report to my colleagues as a fair analysis of the natural gas shortage and deregulation.

I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NATURAL GAS SHORTAGE AND DEREGULATION

(By Peter C. Hughes)

FORWARD

In an article entitled, "The Challenge to Our System," Alan Greenspan wrote that the fundamental nature of our political and economic system has always been taken as a given. We have taken growth for granted, says Greenspan, and this has led to the implicit belief that it is possible to tamper indiscriminately with our economic system, making patchwork adjustments here, and imposing controls there, without affecting our rising productivity and standard of living. I believe that we have reached the point where we can no longer afford this view.¹

Greenspan's fear, that the ever-increasing role of government will somehow change the basic nature of our system, if not reversed, should find little opposition. For while there can be differences of opinion as to what constitutes the proper role of government within our economic system, no one can maintain, as the author correctly argues, "that there is not some point at which government intervention becomes government control of the economy, at which point we have moved, by definition, to a socialist, or quasi-socialist system."²

The danger for any society that cherishes the values of freedom and liberty is that the growth of government intervention can be gradual enough so as not to cause a disruption in the transition, and that the development from a free-enterprise system to a controlled economy can occur before the full impact of the development is recognized. We then become accustomed to the idea that government control and/or government programs are the only way to deal with our problems. This public policy paper does not deal directly with the philosophical questions underlying these political and economic currents, but it does serve to highlight the debate surrounding "consumerism" and its critique of the American corporate enterprise system within the overall framework of the "energy crisis," and the policy options currently being considered by the United States Congress.

INTRODUCTION

Perhaps no issue, with the possible exception of Watergate and related matters, received as much attention as the "Energy Crisis" during the first session of the 93rd Congress. During the last six months of 1973 alone, 21 Senate, House, and Joint Committees held 212 hearings on energy issues.³ Equally significant is the fact that Congress during that same period, enacted only four energy related laws, and only one of these measures (the Alaskan Pipeline bill) will provide for additional oil and gas.⁴ The other

three bills (authorizing year-round daylight savings time, reducing the speed limit, and authorizing allocation of oil and petroleum products) dealt mainly with fuel allocations and conservation. Nevertheless, the demand for all kinds of fuel is up; reserves remain in short supply; and a life-style that has come to depend upon cheap and plentiful energy seems threatened.

A significant part of the national energy shortage involves natural gas, which remains America's cheapest and, environmentally, most desirable fuel. Today, natural gas represents 38% of all energy consumed in the U.S. It serves 43% of the country's industry and 150 million Americans in their homes. Recognizing the importance of natural gas, a report published by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs made this following observation:

Of all the presently available fossil fuels, natural gas is the most pollution-free, the least expensive, the most versatile, and the most unobtrusively transported. It is also in very short supply. Interstate pipeline and distribution companies seeking to contract for additional natural gas supplies have been unsuccessful, except within producing states, where lack of Federal Power Commission jurisdiction has allowed producers to charge higher prices. The producers have asserted that burdensome FPC regulation, in holding interstate prices down, and in actually lowering prices once legitimately charged, caused a loss of incentive to explore for natural gas as well as burgeoning demand for the inexpensive premium fuel. The direct result has been a shortage. Others disagree with this view of the origins of the gas shortage.

Nonetheless, the shortage exists and is forcing hard decisions upon the Nation: Must the end uses of gas be restricted to protect higher-priority users? Must millions be devoted to manufacturing synthetic gas or importing liquefied natural gas to take the place of domestic gas which could be less expensive to produce? Are the estimates of available gas reserves reliable or do they reflect the producer-estimator's self-interest? Has Federal regulation been to blame for the shortage and concurrent waste of gas? If so, how should the law be changed?⁵

In response to these questions the Senate Commerce Committee announced that it would hold a series of hearings on the subject of natural gas regulation beginning in October of 1973. These hearings are being continued in the second session of the 93rd Congress and some for legislation is expected to come before the Congress for consideration in 1974.

The legislation being considered by the Senate Commerce Committee falls into two broad categories, those bills calling for deregulation of producer price controls, (S. 371, S. 1549, S. 2048, and S. 2305); and those proposals recommending regulatory reforms of some kind, (S. 992, S. 2143, S. Con. Res. 31, S. 2506, S. 1829 and S. 2860).

Although Senate Commerce Committee Chairman Warren Magnuson (D-Wash.), upon announcing the hearings, said they would "explore whether or not the petroleum industry is workably competitive and the amount of regulatory reform which may be required,"⁶ Senator Adlai Stevenson (D-Ill.), who has chaired the hearings on the subject of natural gas regulation, was more firm in his position. Stevenson stated that the gas industry "claims that present regulations on natural gas are unworkable. Consumers consider total deregulation unthinkable. I believe the time has come for Congress to consider an alternative that will protect consumers and, at the same time, meet valid objections to current regulatory practices."⁷

Among the various bills introduced, the two most prominent are S. 2506 (Introduced by Senator Adlai Stevenson and prepared at

Footnotes at end of article.

his request by members of the Senate Commerce Committee Staff) and S. 2048 (the Nixon Administration sponsored bill which was introduced by Senator Norris Cotton (R-N.H.). These two bills will be highlighted during the following discussion because they encompass the entire spectrum of debate and the wide difference of opinion over whether or not the wellhead price of natural gas should be deregulated.

I. THE PROBLEM

The roots of the current gas shortage can be traced to recent legislative history and the judicial and administrative interpretations derived from that legislation. In 1938 Congress passed the Natural Gas Act declaring that: "the business of transporting and selling natural gas for ultimate distribution to the public is affected with a public interest, and (that) regulation is necessary in the public interest."⁸

This Act gave the Federal Power Commission (FPC) jurisdiction over interstate natural gas sales to local distributors and over the transportation of natural gas through the interstate pipeline system. A 1954 Supreme Court ruling (*Phillips Petroleum v. Wisconsin*) further extended the authority of the FPC, granting it jurisdiction over the sales of natural gas producers where the gas is sold for resale in interstate commerce.⁹

Even at this early date it was widely argued that the inevitable result of the Supreme Court's expansive interpretation would be to discourage individual initiative and incentive to explore for and develop new sources of natural gas. But the only successful legislative effort to provide for the deregulation of the wellhead price of natural gas was in 1956, in the form of the Harris-Fulbright bill. President Eisenhower, who was in full accord with the legislation, nevertheless, felt compelled to veto the bill because of "irregular" lobbying activities and his fear that the enactment of the legislation would threaten the "integrity of the governmental process."¹⁰ Legislation to deregulate interstate natural gas has been perennially introduced since that time but only now in the shadow of a growing "energy crisis" does it seem that such legislation might be enacted.

The need for remedial legislation pertaining to the regulation of natural gas is evident from the testimony of Senator James Buckley (C-N.Y.) before the Senate Commerce Committee in which he pointed out that:

"Since the FPC began regulating the wellhead price of gas on a widespread basis, we have witnessed a rapid depletion of existing reserves from a 20 year supply in 1963 to less than an 11 year supply in 1971. Since 1968 our Nation has consumed approximately twice as much natural gas as it has discovered and added to present reserves."¹¹

Similarly, Patricia E. Starratt, a staff analyst for the U.S. Interior and Commerce Committees, has argued that as a result of inept government regulation and unthinking environmental protest, natural gas, "our cheapest, cleanest fuel is becoming increasingly unavailable."¹²

Under various pricing procedures the FPC attempted to regulate the natural gas industry and protect the American consumer. But the result has been that Federal regulation has held natural gas prices at an artificially low level while simultaneously stimulating the demand for it. At the same time, natural gas exploration and development has been made unattractive, thus decreasing the supply. To illustrate the point, whereas the price of natural gas rose only 20% between 1950 and 1970, the price of coal rose 80% and the price of heating fuel rose 33%. (This compares with an overall rise of slightly over

60% in the U.S. consumer price index for the same period.) In 1972 the average price of natural gas was 21.3 cents per thousand cubic feet, as compared with 51.7 cents per thousand cubic feet for the minimum commodity value of alternative fossil fuels.

Federal regulation has also produced another problem. Historically, 75% of total gas sales went to the interstate market (primarily domestic consumers): today, only 36% of available gas does. Thus, there has been a long-term continuing decline of interstate sales to the intrastate market (consisting primarily of industrial consumers).¹³

If the Federal government's current natural gas policies have not yet produced a crisis, future projections are not so optimistic. The difference between supply and demand in the natural gas market was approximately .9 trillion cubic feet (4% of annual demand) during the winter of 1972-1973. According to the FPC, if present policies are continued, and we assume moderate growth rates in consumption as well as nuclear power plants that will supply 23 percent of the Nation's energy needs by 1990, the gap between supply and demand could rise to 171 trillion cubic feet by 1990, estimated at 37% total demand or 58% of actual consumption.¹⁴ And the irony of the current gas "shortage" is that there is an abundant supply of natural gas to be tapped which could satisfy both our immediate needs and those for the foreseeable future.

According to estimates by the American Gas Association, natural gas reserves (i.e., the estimated quantity of natural gas that is known to be recoverable based on available technology and current geological and engineering data) as of December 1972 consisted of 266.1 trillion cubic feet of natural gas in the United States, including Alaska. But these estimates serve more as a current inventory than as a basis for future projections. Estimates of "potential" natural gas supplies (i.e., gas not yet in proved reserves) in the United States as of December 1972 have ranged from as low as 1,146 trillion cubic feet to as high as 6,600 trillion cubic feet. These "potential" natural gas supplies become all the more significant when it is noted that 1,100 trillion cubic feet is over 50 times this country's 1972 consumption.¹⁵ Thus, the natural gas shortage does not result from an inadequate domestic resource base, but rather from a lack of incentive to explore for and develop new natural gas resources.

II. THE NEED FOR DEREGULATION

The argument for any kind of regulation is always based upon the idea that it is necessary to protect the public. In the case of natural gas, regulation has been defended, as Senator Stevenson (D-Ill.) recently did, with the argument that the energy industries are stifling competition at the expense of the consumers. Regulation of natural gas is also based upon the assumption that the FPC can, in fact, regulate wellhead natural gas prices on the basis of cost. The first part of the argument, however, is simply inaccurate, and twenty years of experience has taught us that regulating natural gas prices on the basis of cost is not possible.

With regards to competition in the field of natural gas, in 1970 there were 3,700 natural gas producers. The four largest controlled only 25% of the market, and the eight largest controlled only 41%. Such market concentration is not unusual for the manufactured products industry. Quite to the contrary; in over 80% of the "over 1000" classes of manufactured products, the four largest companies control a larger share of the market than the four largest gas producers, with almost one-half having concentration ratios of over 40% for the four largest producers. But market concentration in itself is not indicative of competitiveness.

According to economists a more accurate

measure of competitiveness (in the natural gas industry) is the turnover rate in the market. During his testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, John Nassikas, the Chairman of the FPC, argued that the "grouping of industry leaders" in the natural gas industry is misleading because these so-called leaders vary not only from one date to another, but also from region to region. An analysis of new contracts between 1964 and 1969 in Southern Louisiana, for example, shows that thirty-five different firms occupied the forty-eight possible positions for the largest eight firms.¹⁶ (Louisiana holds 30.6% of total U.S. proved natural gas reserves.)

Nassikas' testimony also illustrated that the "four largest" natural gas distributors sell only 25% of all natural gas sold; not 70% as has been argued by Senator Stevenson. According to Nassikas' testimony, the percent of total annual new sales by the "four largest" natural gas companies (Exxon, Amoco, Gulf, and Phillips) also declined from 49.5% (1964 to 1966) to 29.4% (1967 to 1969).¹⁷ This, in itself, suggests a decline in market concentration. Furthermore, in 1968, the largest eight (Shell, Mobil, Texaco, and Union in addition to the four firms mentioned earlier) held only 41.8% of the total natural gas market.

A report prepared by the Senate Interior Committee points out that there are a variety of indicators supportive of the position that the current shortage of natural gas is not simply the contrivance of producer interests. One such indicator is the increasingly frequent curtailments and shortages even in unregulated intrastate markets. It is worth noting too that local gas distributing companies which have historically been fierce opponents of field price increases and of deregulation, are now largely convinced that there is in fact a shortage and that the shortage is regulation-induced.¹⁸

A former advisor to Democrat presidential candidate George McGovern, MIT economist Paul MacAvoy, has also argued that even if the concentration in the gas industry were higher than the rest of the manufacturing industry (which it is not), entry into the gas industry is so free that the largest producers would not be able to systematically charge higher than competitive prices. In pointing to the so-called non-competitive behavior of the natural gas industry, critics of deregulation look to the large field price increases of natural gas in the fifties. However, as MacAvoy has shown:

"During the early fifties the presence of only one pipeline in many gas fields effectively allowed the setting of monopoly buyers' (monopsony) prices for new gas contracts, thus often depressing the field price below the competitive level. During the next few years, several pipelines sought new reserves in old field regions where previously there had been a single buyer. This new entry of buyers raised the field prices to a competitive level from the previously depressed monopsonistic level. In short, competition—not market power—accounted for much of the price spiral that has been claimed to show the need for regulation."¹⁹

In a statement before the Senate Commerce Committee, Edward Erickson (Associate Professor of Economics at North Carolina State University) and Robert M. Spann (Assistant Professor of Economics at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University), after a careful evaluation of the "structural, behavioral, and performance aspects" of the U.S. oil and gas industry (including the field markets for the natural gas companies) concluded that "in the context in which public policy for natural gas field markets is being set . . . the appropriate market definition means that concentration ratios for gas

supplies are consistent with a competitive industry. Economists often quarrel with regard to the spatial, temporal and product market definitions which underline concentration ratios. Concentration ratios are also only a partial measure of the effective competition in an industry. We therefore also examine behavioral and performance aspects of the industry.

"The performance analysis involved comparing the return on stockholders' equity for the 8 major petroleum companies to: The average for Moody's 125 industrials, the average for all manufacturing industry, the average for Moody's 24 utilities, and the cost of equity capital for these companies. The conclusion from these comparisons is that the petroleum industry is effectively competitive."²⁰

In explaining the reasons for the current gas shortage, Erikson and Spann argued that the shortage is a result of many factors, including a shortage of refining capacity and crude oil imports; an increase in the demand for natural gas; the imposed ceiling on the wellhead price of natural gas by the FPC; and the uncertainties about the future of the regulation of the wellhead price of natural gas. The authors argue forcefully that the most "efficacious" solution to the problem of the national gas shortage is the deregulation of the wellhead price of natural gas and they illustrate convincingly that the gas field markets are "effectively competitive."

The notion that the public would be served by not paying market prices for natural gas is consequently very questionable. An attempt to quantify "gains" has been undertaken by Stephen Breyer and Paul MacAvoy. In their study the authors concluded that wellhead prices were approximately 6 cents per thousand cubic (average) feet below market clearing levels during the 1960's. Thus, if one were to multiply the 11 trillion cubic feet (the average annual production from 1962-68) times 6¢, the conclusion would be that the consumer has saved \$660 million annually as the result of regulation. However, as MacAvoy and Breyer point out:

"Such a calculation contains heroic assumptions . . . it assumes that every cent of price reduction . . . was passed through . . . to (the) consumer . . . For another thing, had producers received a higher price, at least some of their additional revenues would have been taxed away and, therefore, indirectly returned to consumers anyway. Nonetheless, even assuming that the entire 6¢ per MCF was returned to consumers who actually received gas, we still doubt that this benefit outweighed the losses arising from regulation, even from the viewpoint of the consumer class itself."²¹

A summation of the consumer losses, as presented in a Senate Interior Committee Staff report is as follows:

- Insecurity as to future levels of service;
- Denials of additions to current levels of service;
- Denials of service to potential jurisdictional consumers;

- The imposition of high-cost gas supplements with potential for loss of reliability in service in some instances.

Forced non-economic substitution of other energy sources for natural gas with subsequent detrimental effects on air quality.²²

Although the home consumer of natural gas (estimated at 22% of all natural gas consumed) has not yet been threatened with reduced supplies of natural gas, Edmund Kitch (from the University of Chicago Law School) has argued that the primary beneficiary of natural gas regulation has, in fact, been the non-jurisdictional industrial consumer. As Kitch argues:

"The West South Central area is composed of the states of Texas, Louisiana, Arkansas, and Oklahoma. In these states natural gas is largely supplied by the intrastate market. This area is the most intensive natural gas consuming area in the Nation . . . consuming 34% of the natural gas produced in the U.S.). . . . Ninety-one percent of the gas consumed in this region is consumed industrially. Put another way, 40 percent of all natural gas which is consumed industrially is consumed in the West South Central area. By holding down the price of natural gas within the region, the federal regulation has effectively acted as a subsidy to this industrial market, and therefore as a subsidy to the industrial growth of the southwest. The only practical way to reduce the industrial use of gas within the southwest is to raise the price of gas in that region. . . . Put another way, the residential gas consumer of the Pacific Coast, upper midwest and the east coast is prevented by federal law from paying 10 to 15 percent more for his gas, thereby making gas in the American southwest 50 percent cheaper than it would otherwise be and subsidizing the movement of industry from the consumer's home region to the southwest."²³

As to the problem of regulating the wellhead price of natural gas by the FPC, regulating wellhead natural gas prices on the basis of cost has shown itself unworkable during the twenty years the FPC has attempted to do it. The major reason, of course, is that the natural gas industry is not a public utility (with clearly defined costs and assets consisting of replaceable manufactured equipment). It is, instead, a high-cost, high-risk enterprise. The high risk nature of exploring for natural gas is illustrated in a survey by the American Association of Petroleum Geologists which shows that the ratio of dry holes to successful wells has increased steadily over the last two decades. Furthermore, the average number of dry holes per successful wildcat drilling rose by 20% (to 9.44) between 1968 and 1972. The cost of finding natural gas also has a direct relationship to the amount of gas found. It is consequently of equal importance to recognize that the decline in the success ratio has also been accompanied by a decline in the volume of natural gas found. Statistics by the American Association of Petroleum Geologists reveal that the proportion of "significant" gas fields (i.e., a field with more than six billion cubic feet of recoverable reserves) was 24.3% between 1962 and 1966, as compared with 47.9% between 1945 and 1949. Unless major changes are undertaken in the regulatory area the downward trend in drilling productivity is expected to continue.²⁴

One technique used by the FPC to stimulate the exploration for new gas supplies was developed in that agency's decision in the *Permian Area Rate Cases*. This policy established a two-tiered price system for old (flowing) gas and new gas (contracted after certain date). But this procedure resulted in a number of problems, such as the one referenced in the following observation by M. A. Adelman:

"The payment of lower prices for so-called old gas discourages the more intensive development of old pools and the search for new pools in old fields. It makes no economic sense to leave these unexploited if we are willing to pay a higher price for gas, as evidenced by the higher prices for the so-called new gas. It is also senseless and unproductive to have some purchasers get a windfall in the shape of the cheaper, old gas against those who must pay higher prices for the new gas. Windfalls to the owners of unusually good reservoirs do serve an economic purpose—to encourage fresh investment in new pools."²⁵

In the *Permian Area Rate Cases* it has been argued by critics of deregulation that the

natural gas producers received a rate of return equalling 15%. Such a rate of return, these critics contend, is more than reasonable and should be incentive enough to explore for new natural gas supplies.²⁶ But any attempt to isolate the rate of return for specific projects has to be arbitrary. In his analysis, "Structure of the Natural Gas Producing Industry," Clarke Hawkins has charged that efforts to determine producer price ceilings for natural gas on the part of the FPC are "nothing short of ludicrous."²⁷

In discussing the problem of allocating the (joint) costs of gas, a Senate Interior Committee draft staff report pointed to the problem:

At best, FPC costing techniques produce only approximate results, with a tendency to err on the low side in fixed ceiling rates. Producers make decisions based on projected overall costs of a specific project and the return that project is likely to yield. They do not keep separate books on oil costs, gas costs or gaseous liquids costs. Yet, in fixing price ceilings, the Commission has always started with what is supposed to be the cost of producing gas.²⁸

Similarly, Stephen Breyer and Paul MacAvoy have argued:

"Money spent by petroleum companies on exploration leads to the discovery of some gas wells, some oil wells that produce gas, too, some pure oil wells, and many dry holes. Expenditures on separate development of gas fields often yield gas together with petroleum liquids, and expenditures on gas refining produce both "dry" gas and saleable liquids. Expenditures such as these which yield two products but which are necessary to produce either one, complicate a regulatory process based on costs because there is no logical way to decide whether, or to what extent, a specific dollar outlay should be considered part of the 'cost of gas production' or part of the 'cost of liquid production.'"²⁹

Recognizing the problems in allocating the joint costs of gas, the Supreme Court stated:

"Economists have described these difficulties with repetitive pungency. 'To make laborious computations purporting to divide (such) costs is "nonsense on stilts," and has no more meaning than the famous example of predicting the banana crop by its correlation with expenditures on the Royal Navy.'"³⁰

The rate of return on investments in the natural gas industry is an important consideration when it comes to the question of "windfall" profits. As the Natural Gas Supply Committee has pointed out:

Windfalls must . . . be clearly distinguished from anticipated variations in the outcomes of business ventures. Virtually all investment decisions involve, either explicitly or implicitly, an estimate of a range of possible outcomes, from losses (failure to recoup the investment) to large profits (profits very substantially realized above those on the average). This variation in possible outcomes is the principal measure of the risk of the venture. The fact that one out of ten ventures by a company results in extraordinary profits does not mean that the company has realized a windfall profit. On the contrary, if such extraordinary profits were not occasionally realized, then the average income of investments would be lower, and the company's volume of investment over time, by the same token would also be lower.³¹

Two major questions now remain to be answered: 1) Will the deregulation of the wellhead price of natural gas increase the supply of natural gas? and 2) What impact will deregulation have on consumer budgets?

In an effort to promote the exploration of natural gas the FPC has allowed greater price increases in recent years. Actions undertaken by the FPC have included allowing an increase in the area rates of natural gas, exempting "small" producers from direct rate regulations, advance payments to pro-

Footnotes at end of article.

ducers in return for commitments to the interstate market, short-term emergency purchases at prices above established area rates, as well as a recent "optional pricing procedure," which allows for a more flexible pricing based on market factors and economic conditions. These procedures, however, have served only to further disrupt the market as a result of price uncertainty, and because of this, FPC's pricing techniques have been challenged in a number of pending court suits.³² Thus, between 1960 and 1970 there was a decline of 37% (from 5.140 to 3.222) in the number of gas wells drilled. Natural gas producers' expectations of higher prices did produce an increase in exploratory wells in 1972 (ending a 10 year downward trend), but exploratory drilling still remains below 1960 levels, when demand was only half of what it is today. But, if Federal regulation has not been able to stimulate the exploration for and development of natural gas, would deregulated natural gas prices provide the necessary incentive to encourage the production of new gas supplies for the market place and provide for a better allocation of natural gas?

A Department of the Interior study recently highlighted the problem of determining price elasticity (i.e., a product's responsiveness to price) for natural gas as follows:

Regrettably . . . it is not possible to assign definitive values to the elasticities which determine how the market will respond to regulation . . . The difficulty arises from problems in identifying the relevant functions, autocorrelations model specification, degree of freedom constraints, questionable statistical procedures, and availability of relevant data. . . .³³

Nevertheless, various econometric studies which have recently been undertaken have shown that the exploration for and development of natural gas would be responsive to price increases. After an analysis of the econometric research pertaining to natural gas, the study published by the Department of the Interior concluded that it is reasonable to assume that the long run supply and demand price elasticity of natural gas values falls in the range of 0.1 to 1.0. The medium for both supply and demand elasticity was placed at 0.5.³⁴ Similarly, Paul MacAvoy has determined that the elasticity of the reserve supply of gas with respect to new gas is 0.51. Operating under the assumption that elasticity is 0.51, a 10% increase in price would then mean a 5.1% increase in the reserve supply of natural gas.³⁵

A free market for natural gas would have other benefits. As the report by the Department of the Interior points out:

While the extent of alterations in use patterns cannot be estimated using currently available techniques, a few generalizations may be made: (1) deregulation will cause some shift from the intrastate market to the interstate market; (2) this shift, together with the rise in prices, will cause a larger fraction of gas to be consumed by the household (and perhaps commercial) sector, and a smaller fraction by the industrial and utility users; (3) as a result, some industrial and utility users will switch to alternative fuels—namely coal and oil.³⁶

When Congress passed the Natural Gas Act, its intention was "that natural gas (should) be sold in interstate commerce for resale for ultimate public consumption for domestic, commercial, industrial or any other use at the lowest reasonable rate consistent with the maintenance of adequate service."³⁷ The history of the last twenty years has shown, however, that Federal regulation, by holding the wellhead price of natural gas below market-clearing levels, has not benefited the consumer. To the contrary, it has encouraged an excess demand, shortages of

supply, and poor allocation in the market place.

A recent study by Foster Associates, Inc. has illustrated that while the deregulation of the wellhead price of natural gas would provide the incentive for the American gas producing industry to explore for and develop new and adequate gas supplies, the impact on the budget of the U.S. consumer would be marginal when compared to the alternatives presented by continued regulations.

Operating under various price assumptions, including market prices of 45c, 55c, 65c and 75c per thousand cubic feet for natural gas, as well as the complete deregulation, phased deregulation, and deregulation of terminating contracts, the impact on a household's annual bill would range from 4.2% to 7.6%. Since the price to the consumer depends not only upon the wellhead price but such other factors as transportation, distribution, and marketing, and since local utilities are regulated on a cost-of-service basis, it is estimated, for example, that an increase of 150% in the wellhead price would result in an increase of only approximately 23% in price for the consumer budget.

Putting possible price increases in perspective, the median family income for 1972 (according to the U.S. Bureau of Census) was \$11,116. After such things as personal income taxes, social security payments and savings, consumption expenditures for the "typical" family are placed at approximately \$9,000. This same moderate income family spends \$221 for alcoholic beverages, \$189 for tobacco products, and \$117 for toiletries on an annual basis. In contrast, the average annual gas bill for all residential consumers (average expenditures per residential consumer according to Foster Associates, varied from \$90.57 in the West South Central Area to \$205.83 for New England) was \$155.73 in 1972. Put another way, whereas expenditures for natural gas service represents 1.7% of the \$9,000 budget for the median-income family, tobacco accounts for 2.9%, alcoholic beverages for 2.5%, and household supplies 1.33% of the same budget. To offer yet another illustration, a 150% increase in the wellhead price (i.e., a 23% increase for the consumer) would mean an additional cost of \$6.99 to a monthly bill of \$30. In contrast, if the regulation of wellhead prices is continued, and prices are kept at or near their present levels, the consumer will, paradoxically, end up paying higher prices than would come with deregulation. The reason for this is that supplies will dwindle, or at best remain static at such a price level. Consequently, much more expensive liquid natural gas (LNG) would have to be imported from foreign countries.

The U.S. currently imports only 4.5% of its natural gas, and most of this comes from friendly nations. However, the prospect of increased imports in new forms and from new sources (particularly the Soviet Union and Algeria) poses problems of availability, cost, balance of payments, and security of supply (both in terms of economic and military security). As Walter Levy, an international oil authority and consultant has argued:

"The West cannot rely on the importance of uninterrupted oil operations and oil revenues to Middle East governments as a deterrent to hostile actions. Economic considerations, important as they are to the relatively impoverished countries of the area, become insignificant when confronted with political necessities or political pretensions."³⁸

Considering the potential foreign sources for our natural gas importation, Levy's concern would also be applicable in the case of natural gas importation.

Further limitations, according to the Department of the Interior, arise out of the physical requirements of natural gas; this

would include substantial capital and start-up-time for pipelines, liquefaction facilities, tankers, and regasification facilities. The gas that will be available through importation will also cost much more than Americans are accustomed to paying, and it will be far above projected equilibrium prices for additional conventional domestic gas. The Department of the Interior, for example, estimates that imported LNG will cost \$1.04 to \$1.09 MCF, as compared with \$0.61 to \$0.96 for deregulated natural gas at the city gate.³⁹

During testimony before the Senate Commerce Committee, Senator Buckley elaborated upon the cost estimates for LNG stating that:

"The cost of delivering Algerian LNG to the East Coast has been estimated at from 84¢ to 91¢ MCF. The estimated cost to produce and deliver a thousand cubic feet of gas under the proposals now being explored with the U.S.S.R. range from \$1.25 to \$1.50, or two and a half to three times the delivered price of domestic gas at New York City."⁴⁰

The city of Boston, in its efforts to meet peak demands, has also been importing LNG overland from Montreal at prices of about \$1.13 to \$1.58 per MCF; this compares to domestic gas prices of 69¢ delivered to Boston. In short, the American public would end up with the worst of all possible situations if the wellhead regulation is continued and prices are kept at their artificially low levels. Domestic supplies would dwindle, prices would spiral, and the United States would be dependent upon unreliable foreign sources. These foreign sources would then also be in a position to exert political pressure on the U.S., as the Middle East oil producers are already attempting to do.

III. POLICY OPTIONS

Various policy options which have been considered by Congress and the Nixon Administration to meet the current shortage of natural gas include the deregulation of all natural gas, constrained deregulation, progressive pricing policies by the FPC, utility cost-of-service regulation nationwide, and alternative sources of supply. Because of the interdependency of our energy resources, the long-term solution to our energy problem lies in the development of future technology which will both increase our capabilities to explore and develop our resources and contribute to the development of substitute energy resources. However, there also seems to be a general agreement that in terms of our present natural gas problems, the status quo is the least desirable alternative.

Two of the major policy options currently being considered by the United States Congress, as mentioned earlier, are the Stevenson Bill (S. 2506) and the Nixon Administration Bill (S. 2048). These two measures are illustrative of the differences of opinion that exist in meeting the current natural gas problem.

Stevenson's bill proposes the establishment by rulemaking of a national area rate for the pricing of natural gas, subject to congressional review and based upon actual costs of production with a "reasonable rate of return." It further provides that once contracts for the sale of gas have been approved by the FPC, the Commission no longer has the discretion to change the contract price as is possible under current law.

Under this legislative proposal all small producers are exempt from regulation and instead, Senator Stevenson argues, it concentrates on the "30 largest producers powerful enough to exert an anticompetitive force in the market place." The bill also extends the jurisdiction of the FPC to regulate natural gas prices to the "large gas producers" in the intrastate market. Until now, of course, the FPC has had no control over the intrastate market.

Stevenson's "Oil and Gas Regulatory Reform Act of 1973" also directs the FPC to

Footnotes at end of article.

conduct its own review of natural gas reserves. In addition, it provides the FPC with the power to allocate natural gas supplies, during shortage, among all customers and regions. It further gives the FPC the power to compel petroleum pipeline operators to provide service and storage facilities to independent producers and refiners who "meet minimum reasonable requirements." (Non-compliance by a pipeline owner would subject him to treble damage suits.) Under this legislation the responsibility for the regulation of petroleum pipelines would be transferred from the Interstate Commerce Commission to the FPC.

Senator Stevenson says that his legislation has become necessary because the Nation's "energy industries are stifling competition at the expense of the consumers." In support of his position Stevenson cites the July 17, 1973 complaint by the Federal Trade Commission against the Nation's eight largest petroleum companies, charging them with anticompetitive and monopolistic practices. He also points to the fact that fourteen states have either filed suit, or are in the process of bringing antitrust actions against the major oil and gas companies. Thus, concludes Stevenson, Americans are justified in asking if they can afford to turn sole responsibility for (the) price and supply of natural gas over to the very same companies which have already used the gasoline shortage they helped create to drive their competition out of business.⁴²

Stevenson has also introduced an amendment (No. 643) to his bill proposing the creation of a Federal oil and gas corporation. This proposed corporation would explore for, develop, and produce oil and gas on lands owned by the Federal government.⁴³

According to the former Special Consultant for Energy Matters to the President, Charles DiBona, the Administration's natural gas legislative proposal, in contrast to the Stevenson bill, is based on the following assumptions:

The current natural gas shortage is real and not contrived; There are adequate domestic resources of natural gas which would be developed by private enterprise under a proper economic climate; An increased price for natural gas will encourage increased supplies and discourage demand; and Government regulation of the natural gas industry will be no better or worse than it has been since it began and could be counterproductive.⁴⁴

Consequently, the Administration's "Natural Gas Supply Act" would exempt from FPC regulation prices paid for gas, (a) newly dedicated to interstate commerce, (b) rededicated to interstate commerce after expiration of an existing contract, and (c) produced from new wells; give the FPC jurisdiction over rates for direct industrial sales of interstate pipelines; give the Secretary of the Interior the authority to impose price ceilings on new gas for three years after the enactment of the bill; and eliminate FPC authority over natural gas imports and exports.

The 1973 Natural Gas Act, according to the Administration, represents an effort to stimulate the development of natural gas exploration by exempting the FPC from the regulation of interstate natural gas which is dedicated to interstate commerce for the first time, or rededicated after April 15, 1973, upon expiration of the existing contract. As a result, natural gas prices are expected to reach a competitive market level and consumers are protected from the possibility of unfair high prices.⁴⁵ The Administration's proposal is being offered in the form of an amendment to the 1938 Natural Gas Act and the amendment would reverse the Supreme Court's decision in the 1954 case of *Phillips Petroleum v. Wisconsin*.

According to Public Utilities Fortnightly ("Washington and the Utilities," November 22, 1973, pp. 36-38), most of the members

of the Senate Commerce Committee are "behind" the Stevenson measure.⁴⁶ Thus, it would seem that our national legislators have still failed to recognize, as Senator Buckley argued in his testimony before the Senate Commerce Committee, that:

"We have paid a very high price for our overzealous attempt to protect the consumer against the operations of the market place. I hope we will learn from this experience the ancient lesson that one sure way to create a shortage in a given commodity is to try to hold its price below the level which justifies its production. There are certain economic laws which even the U.S. Congress cannot legislate out of existence."⁴⁷

In its critique of the Stevenson bill the Gas Supply Committee argued that although the stated purpose of Stevenson's legislation was "to secure adequate and reliable supplies of natural gas and oil at the lowest reasonable cost to the consumer . . .," the experience under FPC regulation would indicate that this is not possible:

"Rather it (the Stevenson Bill) would, if enacted, serve as a blueprint for a continued natural gas shortage. This is because the Bill—despite the stated purpose—focuses entirely on price regulation while ignoring steps needed to provide increased supplies.

"Perhaps the reason the Bill is so unresponsive to the needs of natural gas consumers for increased supplies is that it is founded on two erroneous premises (1) that there is not effective competition in the gas producing industry and (2) that the FPC can regulate wellhead natural gas prices on the basis of costs."⁴⁸

One aspect of Stevenson's bill that has also come under increasing criticism is Amendment No. 643, the proposal for a Federal oil and gas corporation. *Public Utilities Fortnightly* stated that Stevenson's proposal was the outgrowth of an idea proposed by former FPC Chairman Lee White, currently the head of the Consumer Federation of America's Energy Policy Task Force.⁴⁹ The idea was essentially a proposal to establish a Federal oil and gas corporation, patterned after the Tennessee Valley Authority, to explore for oil and natural gas on Federal lands, which it has been argued, would then serve as a means to measure the performance of private industry as well as supply the Nation with additional gas supplies. In writing about the news conference introducing this amendment, *Public Utilities Fortnightly* commented:

"The sponsors (of the amendment) assured a news conference the federally owned corporation they propose would not be a forerunner for nationalizing the natural gas and petroleum industries, but nevertheless used expressions such as "yardstick" which four decades ago characterized the launching of TVA."⁵⁰

In considering the proposal for a Federal oil and gas corporation in testimony before the Senate Commerce Committee, Professors Erickson and Spann offered the following observations:

"It has been suggested that one part of the solution to the natural gas portion of the energy crisis should be the formation of a national energy company to explore for, develop and produce new natural gas reserves. There is one example of such a venture in another area. This is TVA. The total assets of TVA are about \$4,000,000,000. The total assets of Amerda-Hess are \$1,378,000,000. Thus, if we were to create a national energy company dedicated to oil and gas production, it would only be about 3 times as large as Amerda-Hess. Even if all the resources of such a venture were committed to oil and gas production and exploration, the contribution of such a venture to the long-run oil and gas supply problem would be marginal. Moreover, we could not create such a national energy company overnight. The nat-

ural gas supply problem is here and now. The most promising solution to the natural gas crisis is to allow prices in the field markets for new natural gas supplies to rise to their market clearing level."⁵¹

A study by the Department of the Interior also questioned the merits of a Federal oil and gas corporation:

A public corporation would put the Government in direct competition with a reasonably healthy private industry, contrary to the principles of the free enterprise system; it could destroy the public benefits of private competition within the petroleum industry and related energy production and marketing industries, and introduce the manifold problems and inequities of centralized economic planning.

Whether such a corporation would provide more supplies at less cost, or less supplies at greater cost, than deregulation of natural gas prices depends on one's perceptions of the relative economies of private and public enterprises.⁵²

Within the context of this discussion it should be noted that the Senate Commerce Committee also has a working draft proposal for legislation entitled the "Consumer Energy Act of 1974." This legislation is said to have the support of more than twenty Senators and it includes such questionable and broadsweeping measures as bringing the wellhead prices of crude oil and natural gas under the jurisdiction of the FPC. The working draft proposal would also create a Federal Oil and Gas Corporation to explore for and develop fuel resources on Federal lands. This legislation (in the form of the Hart Amendment) even proposes the creation of refineries to compete with private industry. But, given the fact that our current natural gas shortages are the result of misplaced Federal regulation and not inadequate resources, the answer to the current problem is clearly less government control, not more.

CONCLUSION

The debate over whether or not to deregulate the wellhead price of natural gas has often been presented as a conflict of interests between the American "consumer" and the Nation's oil and gas industry. This is unfortunate because it has only served to cloud the issue with emotionalism. The attention of the American public and Congress has consequently been diverted from very substantive policy issues.

Congress' inability to respond to the country's energy problems is not the result of inadequate attention. During the 92nd Congress, for example, almost 350 bills and 30 resolutions (covering the entire spectrum of fuels and energy policy issues) were introduced. Yet to date the six Senate, six House, and two joint Committees which conducted a variety of investigations into energy-related problems during the same period, have been able to produce nothing but short-run programs of fuel allocation and energy conservation. In the meantime, new customers for natural gas are being turned away (in 1972, twenty-one states were unable to accept new natural gas customers) and natural gas deliveries are being curtailed for existing customers.

According to Fred Singer, a professor of Environmental Sciences at the University of Virginia:

"The most serious consequence of strict regulation of wellhead prices is the fact that the exploration and production of gas has become a marginal enterprise."

Singer consequently argues that a more realistic price for natural gas would:

Stimulate exploration and production of new gas.

Direct existing gas into use for which it is most uniquely fitted (e.g., home heating).

Shift more gas to interstate use.

Encourage utilities to use less gas and release it to the small user.²³

The recognition that the American public will be best served by ending government regulation of natural gas has also been argued by the *Washington Post*. In an editorial the paper stated:

"There is a tendency in our part of the country to assume that whatever is good for the oil and gas lobby must be disastrously bad for the rest of us. Deregulation of natural gas is an exception to this rule. It will mean more money for the gas industry but, much more important, it will mean adequate and reliable supplies for consumers."²⁴

The efforts on the part of the FPC to hold down the price of natural gas for the industrial consumer were, as this paper has revealed, marginal at best. But, as a result of Federal regulation, a totally unnecessary natural gas shortage has occurred. The emotional arguments of those who oppose deregulation have been systematically discredited and shown to have been either factually incorrect or lacking in logical inference. This has led Paul MacAvoy and Stephen Breyer to conclude that:

"The arguments against the present system of gas field market regulation are compelling. Price control is not needed to check monopoly power, and efforts to control rents require impossible calculations of producer costs and lead to arbitrary allocation of cheap gas supplies. In practice, regulation has led to a virtually inevitable gas shortage. It has brought about a variety of economically wasteful results, and it has ended up by hurting those whom it was designed to benefit. Thus, less, not more, regulation is required."²⁵

But the argument over whether or not to curtail or expand the FPC jurisdiction over the natural gas industry has taken on new proportions with Senator Stevenson's proposal for a Federal oil and gas corporation, as well as the earlier mentioned Consumer Energy Act of 1974. The question has now become how far will we allow the Federal government to go in tampering with the free enterprise system. If the argument could convincingly be made that an industry in monopoly collusion was working to the detriment of the American public, government intervention might be defended. If it could be argued that a free-market could not meet the needs of the American consumer, government control might be justified. But no such substantive arguments are forthcoming.

A constructive role on the part of the Federal government lies in the formulation of energy policies which will provide private industry with the incentive to explore for and develop the Nation's energy resources. The government can also play a major role in defining the balance between environmental considerations and economic needs. A comprehensive program for energy research and technological development should also be undertaken by the Federal government. In the interim period it may well be necessary to emphasize the efficient usage and allocation of all available energy resources. However, the proposals now being considered by the United States Congress which would give the Federal government the direct responsibility for the exploration and development of crude oil and natural gas, as well as the responsibility for refining crude oil must receive the American public's most critical scrutiny. For this presents a very serious challenge to the basic nature of our economic and political system.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Alan Greenspan, "The Challenge to Our System," American Enterprise Institute, Reprint No. 13, April 1973, p. 1.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 1-2.

³ For a discussion on this subject see: *Republican Research Committee, Task Force on*

Energy and Resources. "Committees of the 93rd Congress, Hearings on the Energy Crisis," January 14, 1974; (mimeograph).

⁴ An overview of the energy legislation considered in the 93rd Congress, as well as a status report, is covered in: *Republican Research Committee, Task Force on Energy and Resources*. "Energy Legislation Status Report," January 16, 1974; (mimeograph).

⁵ United States Senate, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. *A National Fuels and Energy Policy Study*, Serial No. 93-1 (92-36).

⁶ United States Senate, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Press Release, October 2, 1973.

⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸ Natural Gas Act of 1938, as amended, 15 U.S.C. 717-717W.

⁹ *Phillips Petroleum Company v. Wisconsin*, 347 U.S. 672 (1954). For a discussion of this decision see: Stephen Breyer and Paul MacAvoy, "The Natural Gas Shortage and the Regulation of Natural Gas Producers," *Harvard Law Review* (Vol. 86-941) 1973; pp. 941-944. (Hereafter referred to as *Harvard Law Review*). See also: American Enterprise Institute, *Natural Gas Deregulation Legislation*, Legislative Analysis No. 13, 93rd Congress, December 28, 1973. (Hereinafter referred to as *Legislative Analysis No. 13*.)

¹⁰ Message from the President of the United States returning without approval the bill (H.R. 6645) to amend the Natural Gas Act, As Amended. Congress, February 20, 1952. Document No. 342.

¹¹ Statements of Sen. James L. Buckley before the U.S. Senate Commerce Committee, October 10, 1973, p. 11. Hereafter referred to as "Buckley Testimony."

¹² Patricia Starratt, "We're Running Out of Gas Needlessly," *Reader's Digest*, April 1973, p. 167.

¹³ For a discussion see notices issued on September 2, 1971 and September 12, 1972 by the FPC. See also Docket No. R-389A.

¹⁴ For a detailed discussion on this subject see: "Natural Gas," a chapter from *Mineral Facts and Problems*, 1970 edition. Bureau of Mines, Reprint from Bulletin 650; pp. 118-122 and pp. 132-133.

¹⁵ See: *Toward An Adequate Natural Gas Supply* prepared by the Gas Supply Committee, Section III-4. Hereafter referred to as: "Toward An Adequate Natural Gas Supply." A group of geologists and engineers, sponsored by the Mineral Resources Institute of the Colorado School of Mines has even estimated that there is a potential 851 trillion cubic feet of natural gas to be discovered. The 851 trillion cubic feet of gas is classified in three categories: probable discoveries, 218 trillion; possible discoveries, 326 trillion; and speculative discoveries, 307 trillion. See: American Gas Association, *A Comprehensive Summary: Gas Supply and the National Energy Situation*, 1973; p. 13.

¹⁶ Statement of John Nassikas, Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, before the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary, July 26, 1973.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁸ "Draft Staff Report: Policy Issues and Options Affecting Natural Gas," U.S. Senate Interior Committee, July 10, 1973, p. 8. Hereafter referred to as "Draft Staff Report."

¹⁹ *Harvard Law Review*, p. 947.

²⁰ Statement of Edward Erickson and Robert M. Spann before the U.S. Senate Commerce Committee, October, 1973; pp. 1-2. Erickson and Spann also systematically counter the position taken by Dr. Wilson of the Federal Power Commission who argued that the natural gas industry is not workably competitive. They discuss the high level of concentration in the industry, the question of joint ventures and interlocking directorates and the degree of vertical integration in the natural gas industry and point to the factual and logical errors in Dr. Wilson's testimony. Hereafter referred to as: "Erickson and Spann Testimony."

²¹ *Harvard Law Review*, pp. 980-987.

²² "Draft Staff Report," p. 58.

²³ Edmund Kitch, "The Shortage of Natural Gas," *University of Chicago Law School Occasional Paper*, pp. 10-11.

²⁴ "Toward An Adequate Natural Gas Supply," Section III-5.

²⁵ Statement of M. A. Adelman before the U.S. Senate and Insular Affairs Committee, February 25, 1972. Serial No. 92-22, p. 56.

²⁶ See *Permian Area Rate Cases*, 24 FPC 1121 (1965)-d; *Permian Area Rate Cases*, 390 U.S. 747 (1968). For a critical review of the *Permian Area Rate Cases* presented by critics of natural gas deregulation see: Brief for Petitioners (American Public Gas Association, American Public Power Association and the Consumer Federation of America), filed in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, Nos. T2-1837 et al., December 26, 1972 (mimeograph).

²⁷ Clarke Hawkins, "Structure of the Natural Gas Producing Industry," *Regulation of the Natural Gas Producing Industry*, Resources for the Future, 1972, p. 165.

²⁸ "Draft Staff Report," p. 29.

²⁹ *Harvard Law Review*, p. 954.

³⁰ 390 U.S. at 804, n. 80.

³¹ "Toward An Adequate Natural Gas Supply," Section III.

³² On February 1, 1974, the Federal Power Commission approved a wellhead price of 55¢ per thousand cubic feet for a joint venture that developed gas in the new Big Escambia Creek field in Alabama. This decision has already come under criticism from the Consumers Union and a number of U.S. Senators and, like most of the other pricing procedures announced by the FPC, the ultimate outcome of this decision will probably be determined by the courts. For a discussion on this decision see: Morton Mintz, "Natural Gas Price Move Faces Test," *Washington Post*, February 17, 1974, p. A18.

For a discussion of the FPC's pricing procedures see also "Legislative Analysis No. 13, pp. 16-21.

³³ United States Department of the Interior, *Draft Environmental Impact Statement: Proposed Deregulation of Natural Gas Prices*, July 1973, p. II-25. This study offers an excellent review of the history of natural gas, regulation, including legislative, judicial, and administrative developments. The study also discusses the alternatives presented in various policy options, including theoretical considerations, reserve estimates, and future projections. It also offers an excellent reading list and the study should be considered the singular most valuable source for someone who wishes to be familiar with the subject of this policy paper. (Hereafter referred to as "Interior Department Draft.")

³⁴ *Ibid.*, II-21-36.

³⁵ *Harvard Law Review*, p. 973. MacAvoy has since updated this study. See: Paul MacAvoy and Robert S. Pindyck, "Alternative regulatory policies for dealing with the natural gas shortage," *The Bell Journal of Economics and Management Science*, Vol. 4, No. 2, Autumn 1973.

³⁶ "Interior Department Draft," p. II-61.

³⁷ For an interesting discussion on this point see: "Draft Staff Report," p. 27, with particular attention to footnote 22.

³⁸ See Foster Associates, Inc., *The Impact of Deregulation on Natural Gas Prices*, August 1973, pp. 14-19.

³⁹ "Interior Department Draft," p. VIII-44.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, VIII-37-57.

⁴¹ "Buckley Testimony," p. 5.

⁴² See the *Congressional Record*, vol. 119, pt. 25, p. 32162.

⁴³ See the *Congressional Record*, vol. 119, pt. 28, p. 36115.

⁴⁴ Charles DiBona, "Administration Policies Affecting the Natural Gas Industry," *Public Utilities Fortnightly*, September 13, 1973; pp. 81-82.

⁴⁵ See, for example, the President's "Energy Message" of September 10, 1973.

⁴⁸ See: "Washington and the Utilities," *Public Utilities Fortnightly*, November 22, 1973: pp. 36-38; hereafter referred to as: "Washington and the Utilities."

⁴⁹ "Buckley Testimony," p. 7.

⁵⁰ Natural Gas Supply Committee. "Analysis and Critique of S. 2506." (mimeograph), pp. 1-2.

⁵¹ "Washington and the Utilities," pp. 36-38.

⁵² *Ibid*, p. 37.

⁵³ "Erickson and Spann Testimony." See paragraph 52.

⁵⁴ "Interior Department Draft," p. VIII-24.

⁵⁵ Fred Singer, "A Way to Ease the U. S. Energy Crisis," *Christian Science Monitor*, June 22, 1973, p. 6.

⁵⁶ "Your Gas Bill and the Shortage," *Washington Post* (Editorial), December 23, 1972, p. A18.

⁵⁷ *Harvard Law Review*, pp. 986-987.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY,
AUGUST 12, 1974

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and, at 11:39 a.m. the Senate adjourned until Monday, August 12, 1974, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ABA HOLDS INFLATION SYMPOSIUM

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 9, 1974

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the American Bankers Association recently sponsored an informative and incisive symposium on ways to control this country's No. 1 problem, inflation.

Participating in the conference were some of this country's most distinguished bankers, labor leaders, business leaders, economists, elected officials, and civil servants. I was particularly pleased that two of Pittsburgh's outstanding citizens, Mr. I. W. Abel, president of the United Steelworkers of America, and Mr. Edwin H. Yeo III, vice chairman of the Pittsburgh National Bank, were invited to contribute their expertise to the discussion.

I would like to take this opportunity to personally commend the efforts of the American Bankers Association in sponsoring its symposium on inflation. We are now at a point in our Nation's economic history that we must all work together to purge inflation from our Nation. Efforts such as the ABA conference, which bring together representatives of the diverse interests in our society, are certainly a strong first step toward a useful and united program of action.

I include in the RECORD at this time an article from the Pittsburgh Press on the symposium:

SHORT-TERM "CURES" FOR FISCAL WOES HIT WASHINGTON, D.C.—The former president of President Nixon's Council of Economic Advisers has said short-term economic fluctuations play too large a role in determining economic policy.

In prepared remarks to be delivered today before the American Bankers Association Symposium on Inflation here, Paul W. McCracken cited evidence that the effects of a change in the money supply, for example, may not show up in the economy for six months or more.

"If there are these long lags, responding with a change in policy to short-term wobbles in the economy is a fertile source of trouble," McCracken said.

The economist called the federal budget "out of control" and said billions of dollars of mandated expenses prevent the massive budget manipulations which could be used to control the economy.

McCracken also urged a major study of the holders of massive economic power, including a look into "the role of union monopoly power on labor markets."

This remark prompted a rebuttal from another symposium participant, I. W. Abel, president of the United Steel Workers of America (USW), who said that workers "have been the victims of inflation, not the cause nor the beneficiaries."

Also in prepared remarks, Abel complained about a concentration of power by businesses so that "500 industrial giants now account for 65 per cent of the sales of all U.S. industrial corporations and a whopping 79 per cent of the profits."

Abel was most critical of policy that tolerates rising unemployment in inflationary times, calling it "the attitude that the worker and his family are expendable in the fight to halt inflation."

Both Abel and McCracken expressed support for some program which would aid persons whose income is interrupted.

HEALTH INSURANCE

HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 9, 1974

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, the debate over national health insurance has raised some very serious concerns with many Americans regarding Federal Government control over our private medical care system. Other concerns focus on increasing costs and the decline of the effectiveness of a medical system under Government control. The British system is a good example of what happens when government moves into the private medical care field. The United States must avoid these problems. I would like to enter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Daily Telegraph of London, England, July 3, 1974, entitled "Stricken Health Service." I call it to the attention of my colleagues.

STRICKEN HEALTH SERVICE

If virtually any other national institution were on the brink of collapse, the television documentaries and magazine articles chronicling the coming disaster would resound with cries for nothing less than the most fundamental reform. Just over a quarter-of-a-century after being launched on a tide of ANEVRIN BEVAN's idealism mixed with class-hating rhetoric the National Health Service is in just such a crisis. Yet very few politicians and publicists are clamouring for radical reform. They are clamouring, of course—that being their vocation. But the demand, generally, is simply for more taxpayers' cash to be pumped into the patient. That would no doubt be welcome; the nurses would get a decent salary; ill-equipped and dreary hospitals in the inner cities would be made more tolerable. But of one thing we may be sure: within a short time there

would be another crisis and another demand for more money.

The reason? The service's total dependence on central Government funds. There are so many claims on this source that an individual institution dependent on it cannot hope to have its needs satisfied. Yet for all Labour politicians, most Liberals, too many Tories and most writers on public affairs, the proper way to finance and dispense a service such as health care is collectively—through the State. If the service goes wrong or is deficient it is because the State has not done enough. To say otherwise is considered "selfish" and "socially divisive." Thus, in influential circles, the NHS is exempt from the endless calls for sweeping change in this or that activity. Participants in today's British Medical Association conference on the NHS crisis who advocated changes in financing will, therefore, face a labyrinth of vested interests, politics and emotion.

Yet much more private, non-Exchequer money must be channelled into health care if these recurring crises are to be brought to an end. That is why those nurses who, in the furtherance of their pay claim, of for other and perhaps baser reasons, are boycotting private wards are so misguided. The person paying for medical treatment through private insurance is not seizing a privilege to which he has no right. He is abstaining from other consumption, and setting aside part of his income, because he places especial value on the modest comforts which private wards provide.

Private patients then must be encouraged not victimized. Ideally, most medical care would be private. Pending that millennium, however, the average citizen must cease to regard treatment as "free." Should he not pay for a proportion of it—in varying amounts, depending on how much he earns? Could he not insure himself for the purpose, thus according to his body the same status he does to his car or his house? We are often told that the NHS is the envy of the world. Why, then, has the world not adopted it? Britain is the only industrial democracy where State hospital treatment is wholly paid for by the Exchequer. At under five per cent of our gross national product, we spend less on medical care than any of the others. That is the reality of socialised medicine.

VETERANS' BENEFITS

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 9, 1974

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the privilege of testifying to the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs regarding veterans' benefits. Inflation and existing law are reducing the compensation these citizens are receiving. Thousands of veterans have seen

their pensions reduced, or eliminated altogether, as a result of social security and civil service benefit increases. Congress clearly has a responsibility to act. The retired or disabled veteran has been caught in a squeeze between double digit inflation and lowered benefits.

In my testimony I note that under existing law veterans' benefits are reduced in proportion to increases in other income. It is my opinion that Congress should change its policy and separate veterans' pensions from other income. Veterans' pensions and other benefits such as social security are forms of pensions which the recipients have earned for two different reasons; it is similar to qualifying for two pension plans from separate companies. However, I recognize this is perhaps an unrealistic prospect for the immediate future in view of the stringent budget restraints which the Nation faces. Thus I support an interim measure designed to provide relief to a degree that is affordable by raising income limitations by \$600. I insert my testimony at this point in the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: I appreciate very much having this opportunity to express my full support for legislation providing that veterans shall not suffer a reduction in their pensions when their Social Security or other retirement benefits are increased. Under existing law, veterans' benefits are reduced in proportion to increases in other income. As the Members of this Committee are aware, this has meant that many thousands of veterans have seen their pensions reduced, or even eliminated altogether, as a result of the substantial increases in Social Security benefits in the past few years. In addition, Civil Service and other retirement income has been increased recently to keep pace with the rampant inflation, and these increases also have caused reductions in veterans' pensions. Consequently, many veterans have been unpleasantly surprised to find that they have been unable to reap the full benefit of these increases in Social Security and other retirement incomes.

In my judgment, a strong argument can be made that veterans' pensions should not be tied in any way to Social Security benefits or other income. The veterans earned their pensions by serving this country, and one could reasonably contend that they should rightfully receive their full pension without regard to other income. Both veterans' pensions and other benefits such as Social Security are forms of pensions which the recipients have earned for two different reasons—it is analogous to qualifying for two pension plans from separate companies.

But there is also a less theoretical, more practical, reason for changing the existing law at this time. The double-digit inflation which we are now experiencing works a particular hardship on those citizens who must rely on pensions. The inflationary impact has been the greatest on necessities such as food, transportation, and housing, items which all those on pensions must, of course, purchase. This Committee recognized the severe toll being exacted by inflation last year when it drafted legislation increasing veterans' pensions by an average of 11%. President Nixon signed this legislation into law last December, and I am sure that all veterans are grateful for their increased pensions. However, since last December the cost of living has soared, and the veterans are now in need of even more assistance. By adopting the measures now before the Committee, you can ease the inflationary pressures on the many thousands of veterans who have seen their pensions reduced, or have even lost them entire-

ly, as a result of the increases in Social Security and other retirement income.

More than 20,000 veterans lost all of their veterans' pensions as a result solely of the 20% Social Security increase passed by the Congress in 1972. This Committee has received testimony that approximately 50,000 veterans lose all their pensions each year as a result of increases in Railroad Retirement and Civil Service retirement as well as Social Security benefits.

Further, there are 1.3 million veterans and widows who have seen their pensions reduced by an average of \$8.71 monthly as a result in the 1972 Social Security increase alone. This includes 211,827 veterans losing an average of \$12.14 per month, 466,948 veterans with dependents losing an average of \$9.46 per month, and 525,000 veterans' widows losing approximately \$6.35 monthly.

These numbers will surely be substantially higher with the recently-enacted 11% increase in Social Security.

As I stated previously, it is my opinion that the Congress should change its policy and separate veterans' pensions from other types of retirement income. However, I recognize that this is an unrealistic prospect for the immediate future in view of the stringent budget constraints which we now face. Thus, as an interim measure, I have cosponsored HR 2687, authored by Congressman Hillis. This bill would increase the income limitation by \$600, which would allow nearly all veterans to retain their pensions, even with the recent increases in Social Security and Civil Service retirement. I understand that this legislation has the support of more than 100 Members and of several veterans' organizations. I urge the Committee to act favorably on this measure, or a similar one, in order to provide badly-needed assistance to veterans who rely on various pensions for their livelihood. Our veterans have served our country faithfully and well; we can do no less for them.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and Members of the Committee.

SUPPORT REVENUE SHARING

HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 9, 1974

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with the Members of the House a letter I received recently from Mr. Max Klass, mayor of Glendale, Ariz. expressing support for the Federal revenue-sharing program. Hopefully, his letter will help soften the opposition that some of our colleagues have to this type of funding and provide support for special revenue-sharing programs that can be used to take the place of existing categorical grant programs—programs that in many instances have proven to be wasteful and ineffective.

The manner in which Mayor Klass and the City Council of Glendale have administered these funds is clear evidence that local governments are capable of taking over programs now being run by the Federal bureaucracy.

The text of the letter follows:

CITY OF GLENDALE,
Glendale, Ariz., July 24, 1974.

HON. SAM STEIGER,
House of Representatives, Cannon House
Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SAM: I am writing to reaffirm in your mind my support and the Glendale City Council's support of the Federal Revenue Sharing Program. Contrary to opinions

voiced by some officials in Washington, I firmly believe that local governments are fully capable of managing these funds wisely and innovatively and have done so to date. The City of Glendale's accomplishments and those of numerous cities stand out as indisputable facts supporting my view.

We have recently completed two major capital projects using Revenue Sharing Funds which would have taken many years to accomplish without these funds. First is the purchase of a 320 acre sanitary landfill site which will serve us for about ten years. At the time of completion we will restore half of it to a recreation area and build an 18-hole public golf course on the other half. Second, we constructed and dedicated a modern, complete fire station in the northern part of our City to provide faster fire response and emergency paramedic help in this rapidly growing area.

In addition to these two projects, I have enclosed a copy of our Federal Revenue Sharing Budget which outlines for you all of our expenditures for fiscal year 1974 and estimates for 1975. You will note that funds have been spent for library books, police and fire protection, a refuse transfer station, major street construction, street light signals, and on a summer recreation help program as well as many other projects. After examination, I am sure you will find that we have placed positive emphasis on improvement of government services to our residents.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if I can be of any assistance to you in your support of the State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act.

Sincerely yours,

MAX KLAAS, Mayor.

OPPOSED TO MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 9, 1974

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, it seems that I am all too frequently forced to oppose the military authorization and appropriation bills that rain down on us, and I am again in that position today with the Military Construction Authorization.

While I recognize and commend the efforts made by the Armed Services Committee to pare down this authorization, I still find its waste and extravagance unacceptable, and unfortunately, too typical of all our military spending. We would not have to devote so much money and attention to the soldiers' well-being if we did not maintain a standing Army of the present unnecessary size. We could direct the money spent on modernizing dining halls and air-conditioning administration buildings to making life a little more tolerable for our millions of disadvantaged citizens. When I voted against the \$83 billion Defense Department appropriations bill this week, I observed then that we seemingly provide better housing for ICBM's and for fighter planes than is frequently available for people in the suffering cities and depressed rural areas of the country.

I would like to draw the attention of my colleagues to a recent study by the Public Interest Research Group in Michigan entitled "The Empty Pork Barrel:

Michigan Unemployment and the Pentagon Budget" which shows how Michigan's economic activity was affected by fluctuations in military spending over a recent 30-year period. The study translated defense costs into jobs and examined the consequences for Michigan's economy. The results point to the inaccuracy of claims that military spending is vital to the domestic economy.

Dollars spent on almost any kind of civilian goods or services will create a lot more jobs than the same number of dollars spent by the military. Whether the money is spent by local governments or individuals, civilian spending creates an average of 20,000 more jobs per billion dollars spent than does military spending. A billion dollars spent by the Pentagon hires 79,000 military or civilian personnel. The same money spent by State and local governments creates openings for 100,000 teachers, policemen, and public health nurses. If the Pentagon spends a billion dollars on military contracting, 55,000 jobs are generated. The same money spent by consumers or businesses would produce 75,000 to 100,000 jobs. So-called pork barrel spending on military contracts doesn't put more people to work, it puts more people out of work.

On this basis, I would be glad to see the Pentagon forget the \$10 million which would go to Michigan under this bill, if those Federal dollars could get there by any other means, and I expect that my colleagues from every other State would voice the same feelings.

It is certainly time for the Congress to dictate some drastic belt tightening and not allow the contrived and grossly inflated demands of the Pentagon to continue to take precedence over the real needs of the American people.

PITTSBURGHERS PACE U.S. MARBLE TEAM

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 9, 1974

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, for those who feel reassured when history repeats itself, take heart: competition between Great Britain and America predates our War of Independence and continues more good naturedly to this day. Not quite as extensive as the War of 1812, but no less significant was the recent U.S. marble team's victory over the reputed world champion, Toucan Terribles of England. Modernity required congressional assistance to expedite the team's passports, something the competitors of yesteryear dispensed with.

Coached by Pittsburgher Walter Lease, and paced by Larry Kokos and Ray Morgan, also constituents of mine, our team was armed with confidence, expertise, and appropriately the Bicentennial spirit, as it won an easy victory in three straight games. Permit me to extend my congratulations and commendation for this fine effort and to include in the RECORD at this time an article from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette discussing the victory:

U.S. TEAM BEATS ENGLISH: TWO CITY YOUTHS WIN BRITISH MARBLES MATCH

SUSSEX, ENGLAND.—Two Pittsburgh youths paced a U.S. marbles team to a convincing victory here yesterday over the Toucan Terribles, who have claimed to be the best marbles shooters in the world for the past 19 years.

"We skunked them," said Walter Lease, a Southside Pittsburgher who coached the U.S. team. "They've claimed to be the world champs for 19 years and today they got a lesson on how to shoot marbles."

Larry Kokos, 14, the reigning national champion, and Ray Morgan, 18, who won the title in 1970, represented the city and their Lawrenceville neighborhood in the invitational match.

Rick Mawhinney, 17, of Cumberland, Md., and Ray Jarrell, 15, of Whitesville, W.Va., national champs in 1971 and 1972 respectively, rounded out the squad.

The Toucan Terribles, an all-English team ranging in age from 23 to 50, lost three straight games, 25-2, 25-13, and 25-7.

The Terribles had beaten four U.S. teams during their reign but none with the credentials of the current U.S. squad.

A national tabloid newspaper sponsored the trip.

After a sightseeing tour of London today the team is scheduled to fly back to Pittsburgh tomorrow.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S RESIGNATION FROM OFFICE

HON. ANTONIO BORJA WON PAT

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 9, 1974

Mr. WON PAT. Mr. Speaker, the decision by President Richard Nixon to resign and turn over the reigns of Government to his chosen successor, Vice President Gerald R. Ford, has rung down the curtain on one of the most tragic episodes in our Nation's political history.

There is little that can be said to alleviate the shadow under which Mr. Nixon left office. Yet, I do not believe that his return to private life should be an occasion for joy. While it is true that he was charged with many grievous crimes, it is also true that President Nixon will go down in history as a great Chief Executive for his efforts in foreign affairs. During his time in the Nation's highest office, Mr. Nixon left his mark on our relations with Communist China and the Soviet Union. Where we were once at almost total odds with these two giants, America now has opened an avenue to better understanding and, hopefully, to lasting peace with these nations.

Mr. Nixon shall also be long remembered, and honored, for engineering a truce between two old antagonists—Israel and the Arab nations. His efforts in this matter alone brought the Western World back from the brink of war to a situation where both combatants are at least temporarily at peace.

I believe it also only fair to give Mr. Nixon credit for forcing Congress toward assuming greater control in budgetary matters. Through the inability of the Nixon administration to effectively fight inflation, Congress was thus required to come to terms with problems in its own house before it could begin to deal with those of the general economy.

And lastly, but perhaps most important, I salute the President for stepping

down and arranging the orderly transfer of power to Gerald Ford. In his previous statements, President Nixon had often refused to resign, despite almost overwhelming demands to do so from those within his own party. After personally hearing the tapes and carefully surveying the facts, however, it appears that he recognized the futility of carrying on any further and chose the course of action least damaging to the country and himself. I realize that many will say he had little choice. Perhaps. Nevertheless, by his act of stepping down, Richard M. Nixon did spare this country further agony—a fact for which we should all be grateful.

In the final analysis, of course, history will be the judge of Richard M. Nixon, as it will be the final judge of how America managed its affairs at this crucial juncture in time.

The fact that we were able to complete an orderly transfer of power without the upheaval often found in other countries, and so often heralded by the prophets of doom in this country, is a lasting tribute to our democratic system of government. We have survived one of the most bitter attacks on our political system with our pride intact and our lessons for the future clearly delineated.

No longer can we afford to let one group control the reins of power. No longer can we afford to permit one special interest group to believe themselves above the will of the people and outside of the laws which govern all of our Nation. No longer can we permit even the highest elected officials in our country to ignore the mandate of those who elected them to office. And no longer can our political system afford to permit the moneyed interests to dominate a candidate or party through illegal campaign gifts which amount to pure bribery and a deliberate attempt to undermine the dictates of the people.

If these lessons are indelibly engraved upon our national conscience, then the ordeal we have just gone through will not have been in vain.

In the coming months, President Gerald Ford will have an opportunity to prove that the lessons of the past have, indeed, been learned. As one who knows Mr. Ford personally, I believe that he will set an example of honesty and integrity for us to follow. I wish him every success, as I know my fellow Americans on Guam do also. As your Congressman, I also pledge my support to bring this great country closer to the goals of equality and justice for all. The road ahead will continue to be filled with new perils, as well as the old ones such as inflation. If we are to succeed in overcoming the problems afflicting our Nation, then we must unite as one people. In this goal, I ask your support.

VETERANS' EDUCATION BENEFITS

HON. JOHN P. MURTHA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 9, 1974

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, there has been a very lively debate going on in

the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and through communication between House Members on the legislation increasing veterans education benefits.

I would like to add to that debate by inserting into the record some very valuable information provided to me by Mr. Charles F. Yetter, Jr., president of the Veterans Organization of the Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pa.

I believe these figures well illustrate the importance of the extension of the veterans eligibility provision that would extend benefits from 36 to 45 months.

I thank Mr. Yetter for researching this information and I am pleased to pass it along to the Members of the House, particularly the conference committee members working on this legislation:

Of our veteran population that graduated spring term 33% required an excess of the normal 12 terms to graduate. A review of our entire undergraduate population from 1969-1974 indicates the following % of students who required an excess of 12 terms:

(In percent)	
1969	11
1970	11
1971	8
1972	8
1973	9
1974	9.5

The comparison of these figures further indicates a need that veterans do require more terms to complete their education.

Penn State does offer five year undergraduate programs, such as the Architectural Engineering course for example, and 4% of our veteran population are involved in identifiable five year degree programs. The above figures do not include our graduate veterans of Penn State.

We again urge you to get the Committee on Veteran Affairs to meet and to support the Senate version of the extension of veterans eligibility from 36 to 45 months.

Time is of the essence. We urge your prompt attention to our veterans needs and we will appreciate your full and enthusiastic support on this matter.

THE NEED FOR A COMPLETE RECORD AND FULL DISCLOSURE

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 9, 1974

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the resignation of the President of the United States under these circumstances is a sad chapter in the history of the United States. All of us would have hoped that the events which led to this decision could not have happened in the highest office in the land.

The President has betrayed his trust, but I do not think that this is a time for vindictiveness.

However, I do feel strongly that the anguish and pain which the Nation has suffered for the past 2 years should not be in vain. We—all of us—must learn from this experience and we must make certain that it can never happen again; that never again can the laws be so clearly flouted and the powers of the Presidency be so badly abused.

To accomplish this we must have all

CXX—1743—Part 21

the facts in the public record. It is essential that the tapes being released to Judge Sirica under Supreme Court order be made available to the public and that the Judiciary Committee publish the transcripts as part of their public record. Additionally, correspondence and memoranda and other documents relating to this case should be preserved and made public in the same manner. It is important that the records of the Judiciary Committee be complete in the case so that future generations can learn from this experience and understand why it was necessary for the committee and the Congress to undertake this unhappy task.

Mr. Nixon, of course, has already selected his successor, Gerald Ford. Mr. Ford's position on the legal and moral questions raised in the impeachment process have been made clear in recent weeks and, of course, his record as a Member of Congress is well known on the various issues. I think that Mr. Ford's record and prior statements explain his positions much better than any comments which I could make at this time.

EXCESS OIL PROFITS

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 9, 1974

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, during the past few weeks, the major oil companies have released their second quarter 1974 earnings reports, disclosing gains in revenue ranging from 19 to 292 percent. For the first half of 1974, the oil companies have reaped unconscionable profits at the expense of the American consumer.

I am attaching to my remarks a list of corporate earnings reports comparing the second quarter earnings of 1973 with 1974.

Recent reports indicate that imports of all oils and refined products are increasing and are 2.6 percent greater than they were at this time last year. The imports to America of refined products alone is up by 11.8 percent, while crude oil imports increased by 19.3 percent over the same period in 1973.

For the second consecutive month, the oil industry has had a production surplus, so that refined product inventories now stand at 798 million barrels, 12.9 percent higher than at the same time last year.

In further recognition of these surpluses, John Sawhill, Director of the Federal Energy Administration, had this to say on July 29, 1974 at the recent Western Governor's Conference in Albuquerque:

Current forecasts of petroleum supply and demand indicate that there won't be any overall shortages for the rest of the year. Ironically, we've even had to develop new strategies to allocate the growing surplus of petroleum products.

America therefore, faces the unusual situation where profits and revenues of the major oil companies are increasing at the same time that their inventories are

increasing. It is obvious that something is amiss in our supply and demand economy.

No one would deny to the oil companies a fair return for their investment and risks. But at the same time the consumer should also have a fair price for the product. The oil industry is holding our economy hostage by their contrived, burdensome prices, which have a ripple effect on our economy, increasing the prices for all goods and services. Especially hard hit are the utilities, whose costs have skyrocketed so dramatically that some of our senior citizens are being forced to give up their homes because they cannot meet the rising utility rates.

It is time to end this excessive profiteering at the expense of the American consumer. The oil oligopoly is demonstrating that it cannot, or will not, responsibly regulate itself for America's benefit; if it could there would be no need for regulatory legislation. Obviously there is such a need. In a recent poll of my district, over 85 percent of my constituents favored taxing excess oil profits. I believe that this is indicative of the public's concern about these burdensome fuel prices.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to join with me in seeking decisive action enabling our Nation to impose reasonable restraints on this vital segment of our economy.

Corporate earnings report follows:

INCREASES IN CORPORATE EARNINGS

(2d quarter 1973 and 1974)

Corporation	Earnings		Percentage change since 1973
	2d quarter 1973	2d quarter 1974	
Delta Airlines	\$20,700,000	\$29,100,000	+39.9
Goodyear Tire & Rubber	55,900,000	61,500,000	+10.0
Revlon	11,200,000	13,000,000	+16.1
Standard Brands	11,100,000	12,500,000	+12.0
Stauffer Chemical	11,500,000	20,500,000	+78.3
Bethlehem Steel	57,900,000	69,600,000	+20.2
Emerson Electric	19,200,000	23,100,000	+14.9
Ford Motor	394,200,000	168,000,000	-57.4
Standard Oil			
California	181,200,000	285,300,000	+57.0
Texaco	267,500,000	450,400,000	+72.1
Mobil	184,200,000	354,400,000	+99.0
Standard Oil/Indiana	121,300,000	280,000,000	+131.0
Shell	89,500,000	124,500,000	+39.0
Occidental	26,900,000	92,600,000	+292.0
Phillips	46,400,000	123,800,000	+167.0
Sun	48,400,000	127,300,000	+163.0
Cities Service	30,500,000	53,800,000	+76.0
Exxon	510,000,000	850,000,000	+66.0
Getty	23,600,000	62,200,000	+167.0
Standard Oil/Ohio	27,000,000	50,300,000	+40.0

¹ Denotes an oil industry.

SALUTE TO NEW CITIZENS AWARD

HON. WILLIAM F. WALSH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 9, 1974

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues an award that was recently presented by the Citizens Foundation, Inc. of Syracuse, N.Y., known as the "Salute to New Citizens Award" to Paul and Maria Karpyszyn.

The Citizens Foundation, when established, was envisioned as an organiza-

tion that would be an effective force in counteracting the apathy, misunderstanding and sometimes open hostilities that many citizens were displaying toward our American economic system. This new award has great significance in our community.

Paul and Maria Karpyszyn left their homeland in the Ukraine for political reasons and arrived in New York City with their son, Zenon, and little else except their determination to make a new life for themselves in America.

Mr. and Mrs. Karpyszyn moved to Syracuse in 1955 and both found jobs in local industrial firms. In 1960 they opened their own business, Paul's Meat Market, a prospering meat and delicatessen shop on the city's west side. Naturalized citizens of the United States, the Karpyszyn's were selected to be honored by the foundation for their exemplary conduct in embracing the American free enterprise system.

In accepting this award Zenon, their son wrote:

To my parents who have lived under Communism and experienced the "worker's paradise" firsthand, this award symbolizes all that is great and good in the U.S.A. To be given an award by such a respected organization is for them another fulfillment of the promise that is America.

CAN YOU STILL MAKE A MILLION?

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 9, 1974

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, American business has become an unfortunate scapegoat for many who fail to recognize the important fact that economic freedom and other important freedoms go hand in hand.

Part of the reason for this difficulty is that the advocates of free enterprise have, in many instances, failed to make a persuasive case for their position.

They have, too often, argued in behalf of free enterprise not because it is the system which maximizes freedom but, instead, because it is the system which maximizes material goods.

Both of these facts are, of course, quite true. Our standard of living under capitalism is by far the highest in the world. Yet, free enterprise would be worthy of our defense even if this were not the case.

Discussing this fact, one of the most eloquent advocates of a free economy, Wilhelm Ropeke, the distinguished German economist who was one of the first to denounce the Nazi regime in his native country, declares, in his essay, "Education in Economic Liberty":

We should avoid luring men into acceptance of economic liberty by holding out to them the candy of material abundance: our educational efforts should instead be made on the high level of social philosophy and should appeal to the last and supreme values. Every limitation of economic liberty, every state intervention and every single act of planning and directing, contains some constraint. It is this constraint . . . which takes away from us bit by bit that genuine freedom which is dear to us all.

While recent public opinion polls indicate that many Americans have lost faith in big business, this should not lead anyone to believe that such Americans have lost faith in the free enterprise system itself.

In a recent article, Bernard Browning, president of the International Franchise Association, notes that—

The almost unbelievable growth of franchising—which now accounts for about 32 per cent of all retail sales—has gone unnoticed to most people . . . tens of thousands of Americans who have gone into business for themselves in the last ten years by the franchising route certainly have not lost faith in free enterprise. If anything, the sheer weights of numbers of new franchise outlets would indicate that free enterprise—the chance to make an honest buck—has never been more dear to our fiercely independent people than it is today.

Mr. Browning concludes that—

. . . the American dream is a living possibility for every citizen in this country. And that dream is only possible because we are free men able to work and live in freedom.

I wish to share with my colleagues the article, "Can You Still Make a Million?", by Bernard Browning, as it appeared in the Knoxville Journal of June 29, 1974, and insert it into the RECORD at this time. [From the Knoxville Journal, June 29, 1974]

CAN YOU STILL MAKE A MILLION?

(By Bernard Browning)

At a recent meeting of the American Association for Public Opinion Research, there was some apparent good news for the radical minority who want us to believe that free enterprise has tried, but failed in America.

According to a panel of respected pollsters, a majority of Americans have lost faith in Big Business—feeling it is insensitive to most social responsibilities, wields too much power, and ought to be broken up into smaller enterprises (under government supervision, we assume).

For the doomsayers, these were happy findings indeed.

Apparently, after years of bad-mouthing the American Dream to any willing listener, their minority viewpoint had become a majority viewpoint . . . apparently.

In all fairness to the greatest system of competitive enterprise the world has ever known, the public's feelings toward giant corporations is not the blanket indictment of free enterprise that the social capitalists would have us believe. In fact, while many Americans may feel alienated by monopoly, Big Business, many thousands more have reaffirmed their faith in our system in recent years by doing their thing in franchising.

Everybody's into the act: young people; retired people; minorities; men and women from all walks of life with interests ranging from leathercrafts to business counseling (like my own General Business Services) to health foods, to arts and graphics—you name it.

The almost unbelievable growth of franchising—which now accounts for about 32 percent of all retail sales—has gone unnoticed to most people. They have a working understanding of what a franchise is, and they could probably tell you which retail outlets on their Main Street are franchises, but so what?

The so what is the fact that tens of thousands of Americans who have gone into business for themselves in the last 10 years by the franchising route certainly have not lost faith in free enterprise. If anything, the sheer weights of numbers of new franchise outlets would indicate that free enterprise—the chance to make an honest buck—has never been more dear to our fiercely independent people than it is today.

These are not extraordinary people, nor wealthy people. These are the men and women in every town across the country who know that somewhere, somehow, the little guy still has a chance to make a million.

Oh, we may be fed up with the goings-on between union and corporate officers and some politicians. But that doesn't mean we're ready to chuck the whole thing and say "the hell with it."

On the contrary, I'm confident in this system, and if the growth of franchising is any barometer, I know that the majority of Americans share this confidence.

Let the social researchers say what they want.

Let them conduct their studies.

Let them suggest that we bust up Big Business, or legislate corporate responsibility. And let the government carry on.

Whatever all these experts do, let's hope they don't forget that the American Dream is a living possibility for every citizen in this country. And that dream is only possible because we are free men able to work and live in freedom.

PITTSBURGH'S NEIGHBORHOOD HOUSING SERVICES, INC.

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 9, 1974

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Congress soon will vote final approval of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, a bill which I, and other members of the Housing Subcommittee, have been working on for more than 2 years.

This new legislation should once again put the Federal Government back in the business of providing a decent home in a suitable living environment for millions of low-, moderate-, and middle-income families.

Earlier this year I addressed a meeting in Washington of the League of Cities and Conference of Mayors. In addition to telling the audience of the progress our committee was making on the new omnibus legislation, I proudly described a local Pittsburgh program, operating in a single neighborhood, which was producing amazing results as far as neighborhood stabilization, with no Federal funding at all.

Called Neighborhood Housing Services Inc., this program, built on a small foundation grant, was making low-interest home rehabilitation loans to people who could not qualify for similar loans with financial institutions.

By working with neighborhood people on a very informal basis, the loan fund was providing the tools for people to fix their homes, and thus remain in the neighborhood, rather than letting the homes deteriorate into urban slums.

I visited the Neighborhood Housing Services project at the beginning of this year and was deeply impressed with the expertise and dedication of the wholly indigenous neighborhood staff.

As a result of their initial success, HUD has chosen the Pittsburgh program as a model and is attempting to replicate the Neighborhood Housing Services experiment in other cities across the Nation.

I would like to put in an article from

the Pittsburgh Press describing how the Neighborhood Housing Services program is working on Pittsburgh's Northside.

NORTH SIDE PROGRAM ATTRACTS NATIONAL ATTENTION—RESIDENTS FACE-LIFT CRUMBLING NEIGHBORHOOD

(By Debbie Deasy)

Five years ago, Pittsburgh's central North Side was nodding to its fall. Today, the community is providing a model for the city and the nation.

Neighborhood Housing Services (NHS), a program funded through donations and financial institutions, is helping the community reestablish itself as a respectable and safe place to live. No public money is channeled into the program.

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has allocated more than \$2 million for programs like NHS in 20 cities.

OWNERS REPAIR HOMES

City Council is formulating a \$1.6 million loan fund for housing repairs to be based on NHS operations.

A primary force behind NHS is the North Side community. Homeowners do their own repair work when possible.

As more and more residents take the initiative to repair their homes, others do the same.

Residents form a majority on the NHS board, which decides how NHS funds are used. Director Thomas A. Jones considers community involvement as essential to the continuity of NHS.

Contributions from private foundations have been essential also. The Sarah Scaife Foundation has contributed over \$500,000 since 1969.

Donations are used to form a "high risk" fund for loans, made at interest rates ranging to 6 percent, to residents unable to pay market interest rates. Some loans carry no interest.

BANKS HELP PROGRAM

Through NHS, 25 banks and savings and loan associations also provide loans at market rates to residents who can qualify. These institutions underwrite the administrative costs of NHS, \$35,000 annually. Computer service donated by one of the banks handles loan information, increasing efficiency.

An additional force behind NHS is city cooperation. Jones said the city has enforced inspection codes, increased police protection, installed new utilities and made street repairs.

Services offered by NHS are varied. "About 25 per cent of our work is lending money," Jones said. NHS often finds itself acting as a general financial advisory board within the community.

"ON RIGHT TRACK"

From time to time, NHS deals with the financing of home purchases, but home repair assistance is its chief function.

NHS hires contractors when necessary. "In addition, NHS retains 10 per cent of the contract for one year," Jones explained. "If problems arise, NHS then has the work done and pays for it out of the contractor's retention."

Last year, NHS concerned itself with bill consolidation loans and emergency loans for taxes on home purchases.

These services were terminated at the close of 1973 when the delinquency rate of loans jumped to a five year high of 10 per cent. An auxiliary staff established to deal with delinquencies has helped reduce the rate to approximately 7 per cent.

The low-keyed, neighborhood approach of NHS has contributed to its success, in the opinion of Jones. Above all, he feels the program has established itself as credible.

NHS has met difficulties over the past five years, Jones admits. "I'm not satisfied yet, but I think we're on the right track. We've

been more successful than most in a private program," he said.

SOUTH AFRICAN HEALTH CARE

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 9, 1974

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a letter to the editor of the Post which was printed Thursday, August 8, 1974, and which was written by a very good friend of mine from Detroit, Dr. Paul Lowinger. Dr. Lowinger addresses himself to one of the cruelest aspects of apartheid in South Africa. This article should serve to remind everyone that apartheid is an immoral policy, totally incompatible with fundamental human rights. Afrikaners who now rule South Africa believe passionately in the correctness of their philosophy, of "separate development" of the races. One is reminded that the Nazis too believed passionately in the correctness of their doctrine.

The article follows:

SOUTH AFRICAN HEALTH CARE

The connection between human rights and health is of great importance throughout the world. This leads to concern about the segregated and discriminatory practice of medicine in South Africa which is clearly in violation of the 1948 Declaration of Geneva and the International Code of Medical Ethics adopted by the General Assembly of the World Medical Association in 1949. The details are in a pamphlet prepared by Dr. Sue Dowling for the Medical Association for the Prevention of War in England and available through the Medical Committee for Human Rights, P.O. Box 7155, Pittsburgh, Penna. 15213.

These facts about medicine in South Africa are largely from official statements of the South African Government: Ambulance services are strictly segregated; doctors with very few exceptions may work only within their own ethnic group; Africans may train only at the one medical school in Durban. Two of the five white medical schools train a few Asian and coloured students but these students may not attend post mortem on whites or see white patients and they are socially segregated from white colleagues. The black students have no access to white patients so they rarely see common diseases of the whites such as coronary artery disease. Even at the black medical school there are no black professors or heads of departments. Black and white doctors occupying similar government posts receive different salaries. Black doctors have been barred from attending medical conferences because of the laws of racial segregation. Of course the health statistics show a wide racial differential with infant mortality 19.4 per thousand for whites, 38.3 for Asians and 121 for the Coloured in 1971. South Africa does not publish infant mortality for Africans but the U.N. estimate is 200 to 250 per thousand live births in 1970. The doctor/population ration in 1972 was 1/144,000 for the Africans, 1/6,200 for the Coloured, 1/900 for the Asians compared to 1/400 for the whites.

This information is offered in support of the many South Africans who are deeply disturbed by the situation and who want international support for their protest. In the meantime what can be done? We can refuse association with South African health institutions such as hospitals and medical schools including faculty and student interchange except for those South Africans who are

refugees or reject the oppression. We can ask our journals not to publish personnel advertisements for any racially discriminatory and segregated posts in South Africa. We can contribute support to the national liberation struggles in the colonized countries which include South Africa.

PAUL LOWINGER, M.D.

Adjunct Associate Professor, School of Medicine, Wayne State University, Detroit.

PRESS REPORTS SECRET MEETINGS OF INTERNATIONAL LEADERS

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 9, 1974

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, recent revelations by the Liberty Lobby of secret meetings held by an international group of business and governmental leaders have resulted in press reports of these meetings.

The Washington Post reported recently that these meetings have been "sealed from the press" since the first session was held in 1954. These sessions have dealt with lobbying for more foreign aid.

The Liberty Lobby in a recent newsletter reported that efforts to inform the public of these meetings will continue.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this matter, I place a copy of the Washington Post article and the Liberty Lobby newsletter in the RECORD herewith:

[From the Washington Post, July 21, 1974]

A DUTCH PRINCE BUILDS AND RUNS AN INTERNATIONAL THINK-TANK

(By John Gale)

AMSTERDAM.—It's been 20 years since Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands first produced his formula for promoting the cause of transatlantic harmony.

He introduced the idea of an international think-tank, comprising prominent people from the United States and Western Europe, able to speak with total frankness on issues ruffling the Atlantic alliance.

Bernhard gave the participants privacy. The think-tank was sealed from the press.

The first assembly was held in 1954 at the secluded Bilderberg Hotel lying in wooded countryside not far from Arnhem, Holland. The name of the hotel caught on and the Bilderberg group has continued to meet in different countries with different participants.

Always, however, the chairman has been Bernhard, the German-born prince who married Queen Juliana while she was still a princess. Bernhard later fought with the Allies in World War II.

At various times, the prince has requested and obtained the presence of Henry A. Kissinger—1971, Woodstock, Vt.; Helmut Schmidt, now West German chancellor—1973, Salsjoeboden, Sweden; former U.S. Secretaries of State Dean Rusk and Christian A. Herter; Thomas E. Dewey, former governor of New York and twice Republican presidential nominee; former British Prime Minister Edward Heath, Amintore Fanfani of Italy and so on.

Bernhard promised the conferees privacy, and the 1974 meeting in April was no exception.

It was held in a luxury hotel at the French ski resort of Megeve. Before the meeting, Bernhard entered the downtown press center, the Megeve Sports Hall, which was practically surrounded by police for the occasion.

He announced who had been invited to

the meeting and what the topic would be. He then declared there would be no more information on the three-day session and according to one French newsmen aroused the wrath of assembled journalists by adding: "In fact, we just don't want you around."

Reporters were never allowed to enter the hotel where the sessions were held.

There was only one topic at the meeting: prospects for the Atlantic world.

Eighty persons were invited and among those Americans who turned up were NATO commander Gen. Andrew Goodpaster; former U.S. Undersecretary of State George Ball; David Rockefeller, head of the Chase Manhattan Bank, and Sen. Walter F. Mondale (D-Minn.).

Many of those invited from France stayed away because of the French elections.

Bernhard has made it clear that participants who deal with the press won't be invited back.

Apart from that, he likes to change the faces. There is often a 50 per cent switch in representation from one year to the next.

Procedures have become well established. The main speakers get 10 minutes, other participants are limited to five. Papers written by both American and European participants are distributed in English and French, the two languages of the conference. Votes are never taken and titles are never used. A government official or an ambassador is plain mister. Bernhard is Mr. Chairman.

He is often accompanied to the meetings by the eldest of his four daughters, Princess Beatrix, heiress to the Dutch throne.

"Trix has no voice," the prince said once. "She listens."

The prince is unrepentant about the secretiveness of the meetings.

"The purpose of the conference," he has said, "is that eminent persons in every field get the opportunity to speak freely without being hindered by the knowledge that their words and ideas will be analyzed, commented upon and eventually criticized in the press."

His pulling power appears to date from World War II. Having taken his family into exile, he won his wings with Britain's Royal Air Force and reputedly got into rows with the British for going on unofficial bombing excursions over Germany.

He ended the war as commander in chief of the Dutch armed forces and a good friend of Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower.

"I never regarded the prince as a useless appendage of the royal family," Eisenhower was quoted as saying, "but as a person who was intelligent, interested and ambitious to do something useful and who was greatly respected in government circles."

Bernhard, now 62, unhesitatingly used his wartime contacts to get the Bilderberg conception rolling. He has consistently asserted its only aim is to foster the transatlantic relationship.

"People want to place all possible labels on our meetings, from Fascist to Communist," he has said. "In reality, without striving for clearly defined results, we hold a discussion over a few weighty subjects each time. A better understanding is our goal."

After the United States stymied the 1956 Anglo-French Suez invasion, he said: "In the really bad mood after Suez, we were able to talk in such a way that both the British and French went home no longer mad at the Americans."

Bernhard clearly expects that within influential circles, the ideas emerging from Bilderberg will make their impression. Of his personal role, he said: "I'd consider my own work in the same light as practically everything I do. I am only a catalyst."

LIBERTY LOWDOWN

BILDERBERG BLACKOUT BREACHED (A BIT)

If a chart were to illustrate levels of press discrimination which occurs in the area of

press coverage, two peaks would be conspicuously high. The first peak would denote an almost complete blackout which has been implemented against patriotic institutions such as Liberty Lobby, which advocate an end to banker-internationalist control of America. To prevent exposure of internationalist aims, the Establishment Press evolved the strategy of totally ignoring Liberty Lobby! By this means, the most vocal voice raised in opposition to the surrender of national sovereignty would be effectively silenced.

Paradoxically, the second peak on the chart of "objective journalism" would denote attempts to conceal activities involving the American banking elite. Pointedly, no details of Bilderberg activities were allowed to penetrate the pages of newspapers! The national media intentionally failed to report on the machinations of the coterie of super-rich plutocrats. The decisions of American billionaires rendered far from the House and Senate were completely ignored.

ILLUSIONARY FREEDOM

For several months, Liberty Lobby has waged a solitary war to expose the April 1974 Bilderberg gathering at Megeve, France. The Anti-Defamation League and several other organizations have mistakenly or intentionally ridiculed notions of a press conspiracy to hide Bilderberg meetings from the public eye. Through its Institute for American Democracy organ *Homefront*, the ADL has issued vitriolic attacks against Liberty Lobby in an attempt to divert attention from exposing the Bilderbergers. Liberty Lobby shrugged off attacks, standing firm in its insistence that the Bilderberg gatherings were dangerous events, concealed from the public by choice rather than chance.

Finally, Liberty Lobby's intense efforts have been rewarded. The tip of the Bilderberg iceberg is now visible. Press releases recently issued have proved Liberty Lobby correct on at least two major points:

1. The Bilderbergers do constitute a vital cog in the internationalist machine;
2. The national press has failed in duty delegated it by American citizens.

INITIAL BREAKTHROUGH

The initial breakthrough in national media at the instance of Liberty Lobby occurred when Chicago *Tribune* columnist Bill Anderson termed the Bilderberg meetings "extraordinary" in importance. Even this revelation is shadowed by his subsequent disclosure that there exists "a binding gentleman's agreement that nothing said in that hotel during the three day meeting will be repeated for public consumption." Anderson's June 14 column constitutes an epochal date, heralding the crack in the dam of press censorship concerning the Bilderbergers. Anderson also asserts, "The meetings are secret so that powerful attendees could speak with candor and not in the euphemisms of diplomacy."

Translated, this means participants can make decisions without worrying about petty items such as "national interest" or the U.S. Constitution. Pointedly, Anderson admits "that members can speak as individuals and not on behalf of governments." Here, Anderson concedes the internationalists know no national boundaries but function as "world plutocrats" in Bilderberg dealings.

The second breakthrough occurred in the powerful Scripps Howard newspaper chain. Writer Richard Starnes detailed Liberty Lobby's denunciation of the Bilderbergers. He excused press laxity by calling Bilderberg proceedings "essentially dull," but neglected to explain why a gathering of America's and the world's richest and most powerful billionaires would be "dull."

A WIRE SERVICE FIRST

The most significant article on the Bilderbergers was dispatched June 21 on the Associated Press wire service. AP yielded to Liberty Lobby's pressure and ran a lengthy

story brimming with amazing statements and unique revelations heretofore dismissed as products of right-wing imaginations. Liberty Lobby's pinpointing of Bilderberg operations as completely and deliberately secret was documented for the first time by an "establishment" wire service!

In its story, the AP revealed that Prince Bernhard, founder and sponsor of the Bilderbergers, keeps the meetings "hermetically sealed from the press." This arrogant internationalist, married to the world's richest woman, has utilized his dictatorial power since 1954 to "make it clear that participants who deal with the press won't be invited back." Bernhard, AP admits, "aroused the wrath of journalists" by frankly stating "in fact, we just don't want you around." The AP discloses further that Bernhard is totally unapologetic about his secrecy.

"At our meetings eminent persons may speak freely without being hindered by the knowledge that their words and ideas will be analyzed, commented upon and criticized," Bernhard boasts. This frank admission exhibits conspiratorial manipulations and possible treason, unnoticed by the public eye.

LIBERTY LOBBY ON OFFENSIVE

Liberty Lobby has selected three major plans of attack to initiate in the continuing battle to expose Bilderberg treachery. Liberty Lobby is pressing for answers from government officials under the Freedom of Information Act. On May 15, 1974, Liberty Lobby's General Counsel wrote the Secretary of State demanding a copy of Helmut Sonnenfeldt's report on the Megeve Bilderberg meeting. Under the above Act, the electorate is given access to government information so that it can decide what the government is doing to protect their interests. The Act gives any person the right of access to any document, file, or other record in the possession of any Federal administrative agencies and departments, subject to nine specific exemptions (concerning national defense, trade secrets, personal tax forms, etc.).

Only a superficial reply came from the State Department, claiming "a formal report on the Bilderberg Conference was not prepared, but the proceedings were reviewed by Mr. Sonnenfeldt and other American participants in discussions with the Secretary."

On July 10 Liberty Lobby wrote requesting written details of this Review of the Proceedings given to the Secretary, as well as answers to certain specific questions. The request concludes by asserting, "There can be no objection whatever to your letting us have the written Review and answers to our questions, since it is a fundamental democratic principle that no part of our government shall be secret, and that the acts of all governmental officials should be made public whether they attend a public or private conference, and these acts should be understood, so far as possible, by the citizens." The information requested is vital, because at least five American government officials may have violated the Logan Act by attending the Conference.

Liberty Lobby's second avenue of attack is investigating this possibility. The Logan Act prohibits any American citizen without proper authority from "commencing or carrying on any correspondence or intercourse with any foreign government or officer or agent thereof, with intent to influence the measures or conduct of any foreign government or officer or agent thereof, in relation to any disputes or controversies with the U.S. or to defeat the measures of the U.S.—subject to fine of not more than \$5,000 or imprisonment of not more than three years, or both." Any advocacy on the part of American participants of a one-world system of government would be prima facie illegal.

SUITS FOR SUPPRESSION

Thirdly, Liberty Lobby is contemplating bringing suit against AP and United Press International (UPI) for suppressing legitimate news. By this overt or covert negli-

gence, UPI has broken faith with newspapers it serves and with the American people, who utilize news they receive through media to judge politicians who have been elected to serve the people's interests.

Letters have also been sent to all American non-governmental individuals who attended the Megeve meeting, asking about their participation. In particular, Henry Grunwald, publisher of *Time*, was asked why no report of the meeting appeared in his magazine. As of press time, no reply has been received.

Liberty Lobby intends to continue inspiring masses of Americans to take effective action against outrageous internationalist control of the press. Already the Bilderberg coverage demonstrates that Liberty Lobby has accomplished significant results. Without Liberty Lobby's pressure, there would have been total secrecy about the Bilderberg meeting. More and more Americans through Liberty Lobby are learning that something is seriously amiss in the American "free press." More and more Americans are demanding access to events which shape their destiny! Liberty Lobby will continue to assist them in every possible way.

CHINA POLICY

HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 9, 1974

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, the United States has maintained friendship and diplomatic relations with the Chinese on Taiwan while opening discussions with the Communist leadership in mainland China. Recently, Senator HENRY JACKSON, who returned from a trip to Communist China, proposed that the United States establish full diplomatic relations with Communist China, upgrading our Peking mission to embassy status, and demoting our Embassy in Taipei—the Republic of China—to a liaison office.

Considering the record of the Communist regime in China, this recommendation if implemented would be an insult to our Chinese friends on Taiwan and would be of dubious benefit to peaceful international relations with mainland China. In fact, such a change might upset the delicate and careful diplomatic position of the United States in regard to the Soviet Union and Communist China.

I wish to commend to my colleagues an excellent editorial from the Washington Stars-News, July 12, 1974, entitled "Jackson's Chinese Friends."

The editorial follows:

JACKSON'S CHINESE FRIENDS

This is a strange year, and to the lengthening list of odd happenings must be added the sound of Senator Henry Jackson singing the praises of the People's Republic of China. Reporting on his recent visit to the land of Mao and on 15 hours of "detailed and frank conversations" with top officials including Premier Chou En-lai, Jackson displayed a notable gap in his anti-Communist hawkishness.

The mainland Chinese, Jackson told a press conference, view world politics realistically and have a range of national interests compatible with our own. They "recognize the importance of NATO and the danger of any immediate withdrawal of U.S. troops from Europe." They value "one's word of

honor" more than written treaties, and are too self-reliant to seek subsidies from Washington in their growing trade with the United States. Altogether admirable, and Jackson would hasten detente in that quarter by upgrading our Peking mission to embassy status, demoting our Taipei embassy to liaison functions though maintaining our defense commitment to Peking's mortal enemies, the National Chinese.

Jackson's point seems to be that anyone who detests and distrusts the Soviet Union as much as the Communist Chinese do cannot be all bad, and might be a candidate to make common cause with the United States. His championing of Peking, which most of all fears aggression by Moscow, thus dovetails with Jackson's own fears about the course of American-Soviet detente. The senator from Washington State repeatedly has charged the Nixon administration with giving too much to Russian negotiators, most dangerously in strategic arms limitations.

Jackson has used the Chinese ploy too carelessly for his own credibility, and for the health of American diplomacy with the Communist giants. The Peking regime shares a murderous history with the Kremlin gang, and is no more a respecter of human liberty. Jackson would hold normal trade relations with Russia hostage to the liberalization of Soviet emigration policy, particularly affecting Jews seeking to go to Israel. He does not show similar concern for hapless Chinese risking their lives swimming to Hong Kong.

But it is in the diplomacy of detente that Jackson's championing of Peking could have mischievous effect, especially since he is a Democratic presidential hopeful and a leading congressional critic of the Nixon effort to improve East-West relations. In dealing with each Communist power, the administration has been at pains to overcome suspicion that it might play off one against the other. It is in no one's interest to increase Soviet-Chinese tensions and possibly help provoke a calamitous clash. Jackson's siding with Peking, if he were calling the shots in American foreign policy, would be sure to raise Moscow's paranoia to a dangerous level.

IT IS ALL OVER

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 9, 1974

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as a longtime supporter of the space program I can understand the frustrations the NASA officials face in public recognition of the great achievements of the space flights. This point is very well made in an article in the Press Publications serving West Cook County in a lead editorial of July 24:

IT IS ALL OVER

Saturday marks the fifth anniversary of Man's walk on the moon. The honor went to three American astronauts, Neil Armstrong, Edwin Aldrin and Michael Collins.

The dream which had seemed so far away in 1955 had become a reality and now, only 19 years later, is considered passe. Our men have been to the moon and back. They have walked on the moon and in space. They have linked up with a space laboratory and proved they could live there on a new frontier.

But now, it is all over. However, mankind will benefit from the work of the many thousands of unseen persons who assisted with the program.

The new products and fibers which were developed for the program are in use today in our society. The new medical techniques are being used to save lives in hospitals around the nation.

For some, the brief interludes they spent working often behind locked doors, on the project and related matters will provide stories they will tell their children and grandchildren for years to come.

For there was certainly no greater thrill than to have a message relayed to us from Neil Armstrong than that the artist's concept of what the moon was like for simulated television movies was the closest thing one could have envisioned to what it was really like.

Thus, less than 20 years after the planning began, the dream has been realized and put back on the shelf for another time and another generation of adventurers.

It was a great dream while it lasted but no longer will story-tellers be able to say the moon is "made of green cheese" for we now have the moon dust to prove it is not.

OPINION POLL

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 9, 1974

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have just released the results of my annual Colorado Second District opinion poll. As in the past, I am inserting the results in the RECORD to give my colleagues an opportunity to see the overwhelming response from my constituents.

Once again, Second District residents revealed their knowledge of, and interest in, the important affairs of Congress and the Nation. More than 35,000 responses were received—several thousand of them with personal comments attached.

In the past, the residents of the Second District have accurately reflected the attitudes of the Nation as a whole on vital issues of the day, and this year's tabulation reveals the same trend.

For example, a majority—57 percent—favored impeachment compared with 34 percent who were against bringing President Nixon to trial in the Senate. The results of the poll were compiled before the President's revelation of the three damaging tapes of June 23, 1972, and his subsequent resignation.

One issue on which Second District residents feel particularly strong is busing: 72 percent of those responding favored our efforts in the House to curb busing to achieve racial balance in our schools while only 18 percent opposed these efforts.

The desire for Congress to approve catastrophic illness insurance for all Americans drew a large, favorable response.

Second District residents continue to oppose amnesty for those who chose not to serve in the Armed Forces in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the people of the Second District should be commended for their continuing, enthusiastic response to the opinion poll.

Our Nation may have problems, but I continue to have faith in our ability to

solve those problems. Thanks to an informed, intelligent electorate this spirit has endured. I am most grateful to the residents of the Second District for sharing their feelings with me, because I will be better able to represent them here in Congress.

Results of the poll follow:

POLL RESULTS

(NOTE.—Figures in tables express percentage.)

1. Should the House of Representatives impeach (bring to trial in the Senate) President Nixon?

Yes	57
No	34
Undecided	7
No response	2

2. Should Congress repeal the mandatory 55 m.p.h. speed limit now that the oil embargo has been lifted?

Yes	27
No	68
Undecided	3
No response	2

3. Should some form of amnesty be granted to those young Americans who chose not to serve in the Armed Forces in Viet Nam?

Yes	35
No	58
Undecided	7
No response	2

4. Do you feel Congress acted wisely in allowing wage and price controls to expire on April 30th?

Yes	40
No	40
Undecided	17
No response	3

5. Do you favor an amendment to the Constitution which would reverse the most recent Supreme Court decision (*Roe v. Wade*) on abortion?

Yes	19
No	49
Undecided	24
No response	9

6. Do you support efforts in the House of Representatives to restrict busing as a means of achieving racial balance in the public schools?

Yes	75
No	18
Undecided	5
No response	2

7. Should the federal government finance campaigns for federal elective office?

Yes	36
No	51
Undecided	11
No response	3

8. Do you favor legislation to provide health insurance for catastrophic illnesses for all citizens?

Yes	66
No	22
Undecided	9
No response	2

9. Do you believe members of the House of Representatives should be elected to terms of four years rather than the present two years?

Yes	43
No	46
Undecided	8
No response	2

10. Do you favor federal legislation to provide financial incentives for states to adopt comprehensive land use plans?

Yes	52
No	28
Undecided	16
No response	4

(Figures shown above may not add to exactly 100 percent due to rounding.)

ECO-TIPS NO. 7: NUCLEAR ENERGY

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 9, 1974

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the energy crisis is still with us, and so is our concern for the quality of the environment. Add to it the effects these issues have on our economy and you must conclude that we have here the crucial issues of the day, the issues that deeply concern most Americans. These issues will not come to rest until many more people are better informed about the various options open to them.

In a continuing attempt to encourage national debate on environmental issues, Concern, Inc., has just published the first two sections of its three-part study of energy alternatives. Part I deals with fossil fuels and part II with nuclear energy. Part III, to be published in October, will deal with clean, renewable sources, such as solar and geothermal energy.

I believe that this is a critical time for decisions on energy alternatives. I am convinced that our energy-driven inflation will not come to an end, until we have the will, the means, and the know-how to become self-sufficient.

The Energy Research and Development Administration—ERDA—will have to play a leading role toward this national objective. In my considerable effort to bring ERDA to fruition I have never failed to stress the need for parity in the development of our fossil fuels, especially coal, and the promise of nuclear power. To help us and others to reach a more balanced view about these two large reservoirs of energy and their effects on the environment, I would like to insert these two brief summaries prepared by Concern, Inc. into the RECORD:

ECO-TIPS No. 7. ENERGY ALTERNATIVES— PART II: NUCLEAR ENERGY

"Because final acceptability of fission energy cannot be taken for granted, a warning should be issued that large scale application of fission technology may not be a realistic solution to the world's energy problem."—Dr. Hannes Alfvén, Nobel Laureate in Physics.

NUCLEAR ENERGY

Electricity from nuclear energy is produced by a fission process. Fission is the splitting of the nucleus of an atom into two or more parts. The fissioning of enriched uranium creates the heat necessary to produce steam to drive the turbines which generate electricity.

Nuclear energy was at one time considered the hope of the future, promising an inexhaustible supply of safe, clean and economical energy. In recent years, however, serious questions have been raised about the dangers inherent in a growing reliance on nuclear sources of power. There are now approximately 44 "operable" nuclear power plants

in this country. The Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) estimates that there will be 1,000 nuclear plants in the United States by the year 2000.

We believe that a full public discussion should take place before we become irrevocably committed to a course of action that could threaten the health and safety of all future generations.

Are You Aware That:

No adequate long range techniques for the storage and disposal of nuclear wastes have yet been perfected. Some of these wastes will be radioactive for hundreds of thousands of years, and will need to be guarded virtually forever. Cancer and genetic damage can result from exposure to radioactivity.

There is no adequate protection against theft of nuclear materials by those intent on blackmail or sabotage. A crude bomb could be made from highly enriched uranium or plutonium. (Plutonium is a byproduct of the fission process.)

Any nation with a nuclear power plant has a nuclear weapons capability, if it is willing to make a major investment in fuel reprocessing facilities.

It is estimated that nuclear materials, both fuel and wastes, will be transported throughout the U.S. at the rate of 500 shipments per week by the year 2000. This would amount to 28,000 shipments per year liable to accident or theft.

Because of human error and mechanical and engineering defects, many nuclear power plants today are unreliable and have been closed down for indefinite periods of time.

If a major accident should occur, and emergency cooling systems prove inadequate, the reactor core of the power plant would "melt-down" in a very short time, releasing large quantities of radioactivity to the environment. No successful testing of the emergency cooling system has yet been done.

Evacuation routes in case of a nuclear power plant accident are just beginning to be publicly discussed.

No adequate insurance exists to reimburse you, your family, and your community in case of serious nuclear accident.

If we become heavily committed to nuclear energy, and a serious accident should occur anywhere in the world, it seems likely that other nuclear plants would shut down for safety reasons. This could cripple the entire country and, perhaps, the world.

Many people think of nuclear energy only in terms of the nuclear power plant but before nuclear fuel can arrive at the power plant, it must be taken step by step through several preliminary processes. The nuclear fuel cycle starts with the mining and milling of uranium. From there the uranium oxide is sent to a conversion plant where it is converted to uranium hexafluoride. This product is then sent to an enrichment plant where the amount of fissionable uranium is increased. From there, the enriched uranium goes to a fuel fabrication plant where nuclear fuel rods are made. These rods are then transported to the nuclear reactor where the fission of atoms creates the heat to generate electricity.

After the fuel has been used for a year or so, it must be removed and sent to a reprocessing plant, where usable uranium and plutonium are separated out and the remaining wastes, which are highly radioactive, must be stored and guarded until they can somehow be disposed of safely.

MINING AND MILLING OF URANIUM

Natural uranium ore has been mined and milled in the U.S. since the early 1940's. The purpose of the milling operation is to separate uranium from extraneous rock by mechanical crushing of the ore. The dangers involved in these operations are:

Exposure of workers to high doses of radiation to the bone and lung;

Production of wastes (99% of the ore), called mill tailings, from which radioactivity will emanate indefinitely.

The AEC has limited its regulatory authority over mill tailings only to the time the mill is actually in operation. Many tailings piles remain abandoned and unsupervised. As of 1970, there were more than 80 million metric tons of tailings on 2,100 acres of western land from both operating and abandoned mills.

Uranium mill tailings have been used in the construction of houses and buildings in the areas near the mill and have unnecessarily exposed the general public to a further radiation hazard. Steps are now being taken to correct this problem but it has taken nearly 20 years to recognize its scope.

THE CONVERSION OF URANIUM

Powdered uranium oxide is combined with fluorine and converted to uranium hexafluoride. Although the risks involved in this process are small, improvement is needed in the control of radioactive wastes, both liquid and airborne.

THE ENRICHMENT OF URANIUM

The three enrichment plants which now exist in the U.S. (all owned by the AEC) use a gaseous diffusion method to increase the proportion of U-235 (necessary for a fission reaction) in the uranium. This process presents some environmental and economic problems:

The buildings require great amounts of land. The three existing plants take up a total of 1,500 acres;

They are very expensive. Each plant costs about \$2 billion in construction alone;

The process uses enormous amounts of energy, enough to supply the electrical needs of a city of several thousand people. This energy comes from strip-mined coal.

The AEC has announced that it is giving up its enrichment monopoly and is going to license private corporations to build their own gaseous diffusion plants. It is believed that the costs of enriched fuel will go up when this occurs.

FUEL FABRICATION

Enriched uranium pellets are packed into fuel rods for use in the reactor core. Due to leaks, spills and breakage, some of the enriched uranium is released to the waste streams of the plant and small quantities escape.

NUCLEAR REACTORS

Most nuclear reactors in the U.S. today are light water reactors. The term "light water" refers to the coolant used to moderate temperatures within the reactor. The loss of this coolant could cause a meltdown accident with attendant widespread radioactive contamination. Other problems of nuclear reactors include:

Some small amounts of radiation routinely emitted from the reactor;

Thermal pollution in adjacent waterways;

Shutdowns for unforeseen malfunctions or routine maintenance accounting for 33% of the plant's operational time. This compares with 10% downtime for fossil fuel plants;

"Abnormal events," 861 of which occurred in 1973, and 371 of which had the potential of being hazardous, according to the AEC;

High radiation exposure to workers in the plant.

A nuclear reactor has a life expectancy of about 30 years. After that time it must be decommissioned and "entombed" because of remaining high radioactivity. The entombed plants must be guarded constantly and at high costs. If the AEC projections on the growth of nuclear energy are correct, we will soon have hundreds and eventually thousands of ghostly radioactive structures dotting our landscape.

As of January, 1974, two companies in the U.S. had sold 46 nuclear reactors to foreign countries, not all of which have the stable

governments or operate under safeguards. The great care which must be taken in the operation, maintenance and safeguarding of these plants makes the policy of foreign sales alarming. Enough plutonium is generated by the fissioning of uranium at a single large reactor to make dozens of atomic bombs a year.

BREEDER REACTOR

Projected for the future are fast-breeder reactors cooled by liquid sodium. A Breeder is a nuclear reactor that produces more fuel than it consumes. The Breeder reactor will present all the same problems as the conventional reactor, plus a few of its own:

The Breeder will produce far more plutonium than conventional reactors. Plutonium is one of the most toxic substances known to man. Small amounts inhaled into the lungs or absorbed into the blood stream cause almost certain cancer; larger amounts cause death. Plutonium has a half-life of over 24,000 years (which means that after 24,000 years only half its radioactivity will have dissipated). No one knows how or if all the plutonium generated by the Breeder can be used, stored and transported safely.

The liquid sodium used as coolant is extremely volatile and ignites on contact with air or water.

The costs of the Breeder reactor will be considerably higher than conventional reactors. Nevertheless the AEC projects that 400 of the 1,000 reactors operating by the year 2000 will be Breeder reactors.

FUEL REPROCESSING

During the process of separating uranium and plutonium from fission waste products, some radioactive materials are emitted into the environment. These include krypton-85, tritium, iodine-129, and tiny particles of plutonium. The reprocessing plants are the largest single potential source of radiation contamination in the fuel cycle.

Serious radiation contamination is created from uncontrolled gaseous and liquid emissions.

Waste fission products are generated that are so highly radioactive that they must be separated from the environment for thousands of years.

Krypton-85 routinely emitted dissipates in the atmosphere, becomes distributed throughout the northern hemisphere and slowly accumulates in higher and higher concentrations. Thus it is possible that we could eventually be slowly poisoned not only by our own emissions but by British, Russian or Japanese krypton-85.

Technology for concentrating and bottling krypton-85 has been successfully tested in pilot plants, but is not currently in use. Iodine-129 could be removed by scrubbers. Plutonium could be controlled by filters. There is no method commercially available to remove the tritium.

NUCLEAR WASTES

Waste products accumulate from nearly all stages of the nuclear fuel cycle. Waste tailings from the milling operation (discussed above) emit harmful radiation. Low Level Wastes from other stages in the fuel cycle include liquid and solid wastes from processing, and such things as gloves, tools, boxes and piping, which are contaminated with radioactivity. These are not harmless wastes, and must be handled properly by licensed commercial firms.

They are buried in shallow trenches at one of six locations. The public must be kept away.

About 6 million cubic feet of such wastes will have accumulated by 1985.

High Level Wastes are those generated at reprocessing plants where plutonium and uranium are separated from fission waste products. They emerge in liquid form and are initially stored in huge underground tanks. Such wastes are extremely hazardous.

They are both very hot and very highly radioactive and must not be allowed to enter the environment for many thousands of years until their intense radioactivity has dissipated.

Liquid wastes could leak into underground water supplies. Leaks have already occurred with wastes from the weapons program. Well over 100,000 gallons of these wastes have escaped and seeped into the ground.

Methods are being devised to solidify wastes soon after reprocessing. These may be easier to handle and store, but they will remain highly radioactive and will need proper shielding and perpetual surveillance.

Eventually, the AEC hopes to dispose of all these proliferating nuclear wastes in a permanent underground resting place, such as a salt mine, but no geologically satisfactory location has yet been found nor is there any real assurance that one will be found.

The critical question facing the public right now is whether or not we have the moral right to satisfy our own galloping energy demands while leaving to future generations the awesome problem of how to deal with our nuclear garbage.

TRANSPORTATION

Transportation of nuclear materials occurs between each stage of the nuclear fuel cycle. This widens the opportunity for accident or theft. "There's no question transportation is our weakest link," says a spokesman for the AEC. "If a terrorist is going to make an attempt, that's where he'll make it."

The U.S. goes to great lengths to guard its atomic weapons during transportation. The weapons are moved with armed guards and other necessary safeguards by air, train and truck. However, shipments of nuclear fuels to and from civilian plants are transported without similar safeguards.

Most nuclear materials now travel by truck. One shipment of uranium, investigated by the General Accounting Office, involved an open truck driven by one driver, unarmed, with no alarm system or radio, traveling on a route of his own choice.

Truck routes often involve thousands of miles of freeways, turnpikes, and other public roads.

While theft is a major concern of the AEC, the threat of a radioactive spill is the deepest concern of the railroads.

Radioactive materials such as spent fuel rods are hauled from plants in train cars mixed with other freight moving at high speeds along regular rail routes.

The AEC estimates that by the year 2000 it will be shipping all its spent radioactive fuel by rail.

These "very hot" fuel shipments might be damaged in collisions, derailments or fires, causing their contents to spill out. The countryside and the right of way would be contaminated with radioactivity for long periods of time.

INSURANCE

Private insurance companies refuse to insure citizens against loss of life and property in case of nuclear accident. The public is covered only by the Price-Anderson Act, which sets a ceiling on payment of \$560 million for one catastrophe regardless of the size of the real damage which could, according to the AEC, exceed \$7 billion. This Act also stipulates that about 80% of the \$560 million would be paid by the taxpayer, not by the AEC or the utility.

The American taxpayer has underwritten the costs of insurance for the nuclear power industry. Those who oppose the provisions of the Act feel that the utilities who build nuclear plants should assume greater financial responsibility in case of a nuclear accident.

CONCLUSION

Many people are aware of the hazards of nuclear energy, but are persuaded that we must develop this source because of our es-

calating energy demands. We believe, however, that clean and safe alternatives can be developed in time to meet our future needs if we commit sufficient funds to this purpose. Meanwhile we must embark on a program of energy conservation. The less energy we demand, the greater freedom we will have in choosing among our sources of supply.

Since nuclear energy now supplies only about 1% of our total energy needs, we still have time to reexamine the basic issue of whether or not we want to rush headlong into developing a source of energy that could imperil the future of society.

Most important decisions on nuclear energy have, until now, been made by the government and by the Atomic Energy Commission (created by Congress in 1946). Often decisions were made on the basis of information unavailable to the public. *It is time now for citizens to know the facts and to be heard on this issue.*

If you share our concern, let us hear from you. Get involved in issues within your own community. Talk to your power company. Write letters. Participate in the important national decisions now being made that will affect you and your children.

SPIRALING PRICES

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 9, 1974

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include for the record words of wisdom from the column of the late and lamented Allan M. Trout, who majored in barnyard science, but also expanded his studies into the field of economics. I submit that his remarks on inflation are particularly applicable today, since we are in the midst of spiraling prices:

On September 29, 1964, Mr. Trout had the following for his column:

"Did you ever take the time," asks Irvin R. Arrowood, Paintsville, 'to figure out why we get so many notices, invitations, etc., announcing weddings, graduations, anniversaries, baby showers, etc?'

"I can't figure out whether it was the merchants who got this all started, or whether it was the people who needed, or craved, the presents they expected to get. Around graduation time we get announcements from people we don't know. I have decided they take the phone book and go right down the list. In my candid opinion, this thing, like Christmas, has become mercenary and should be curtailed. What do you think?"

"Thank you, Mr. Arrowood. Twenty, 15, or even 10 years ago, I might have joined you in viewing with alarm the facts as you state them. But the more I study the erratic economics of our disjointed times, the more I embrace the unsteady opinion that nothing matters, really, so long as we keep money circulating.

"In simplest, essence, it seems to me that the government prints up a lot of money, makes it easy for the haves to get a lot and the have-nots to get a little, then expects all of us to keep it circulating in order to keep the country going.

"It seems to me that the character of spending has become amoral; that is to say, it does not matter whether you spend a dollar for a useful or a useless purpose, just so you keep the dollar moving by spending it.

"It seems to me that if everybody began to practice thrift, and to save back some-

thing for a rainy day, the country could not survive such frugality. And if people bought only what they need, never spent anything foolishly, twould only compound the fiscal catastrophe.

"So I say to you, sir, no harm is done by the flood of notices, invitations, etc., that you get from strangers who get your name out of the phone book, of course it is a pleasure to buy gifts for friends, just as it is their pleasure to buy gifts for you upon appropriate occasions.

"But when you throw alien invitations into the wastebasket you become a useful cog in the national apparatus for keeping the dollar in fast motion. Waste? I would say so. The stamp had to be bought, and that gives the postman employment. The invitation had to be bought, and that makes business for the men who cut the trees, the mill that makes the paper, the jobber who sells it and the printer who imprints it.

"Moreover, Mr. Arrowood, to transfer your name from the phone book to the address on the invitation makes you an unwitting party to the uplifting process of inculcating hope in the human beast. To inspire is noble, and the opportunity to do so without effort is not to be sneezed at."

THE PRESIDENT'S RESIGNATION

HON. WILLIAM H. HUDNUT III

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 9, 1974

Mr. HUDNUT. Mr. Speaker, the President's resignation brings to a close a sad ordeal for the American people. Mr. Nixon has given long and thoughtful consideration to what is best for our country and I respect his decision. I wish him and his family well in the future.

I am convinced that history will record the substantial achievements of the Nixon administration. Few Presidents did more for world peace than Richard Nixon. Because of him, the longest and costliest war in our history was ended; détente with Russia and China has been achieved; and prospects for peace in the Middle East have never been better. At home, he has reversed the flow of power to Washington and has returned Government to our local officials.

But now we must consider the future of our country. As a newcomer to the Halls of Congress plunged unexpectedly into the midst of this national turmoil, I have come to appreciate the stability and viability of our governmental system. It works; it does not crumble under pressure. Today the American people can take pride and confidence in the knowledge that the United States is unique among nations; even in times of crisis our transition of power is orderly.

We can be assured that our friend and former colleague, the Honorable Gerald Ford, as President, will provide strong and reconciling leadership to our country. I pledge him my full support and cooperation.

This has been an agonizing period in our history, and it is my sincere hope and prayer that this great Nation under God will emerge from its current difficulties with clearer vision, better health, and stronger spirit.

STATEHOOD FOR ISLANDS OF MICRONESIA

HON. ANTONIO BORJA WON PAT

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 9, 1974

Mr. WON PAT. Mr. Speaker, on July 27 my friend and colleague, GLENN ANDERSON, delivered an address before the Guamanian Association of Long Beach, Calif.

In his remarks he expounded upon the envisioned statehood of the islands of Guam, Marianas, Trinitian, and other islands of Micronesia as our 51st State.

As a Congressman who probably represents more Guamanians than any other Congressman in the continental United States, he shares with me a mutual concern for these good people of Micronesia.

His remarks provide interesting background into this timely issue; therefore, I should like to print the text of Congressman ANDERSON's remarks into the RECORD:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN GLENN M. ANDERSON

Thank you, Mr. Chairman—President Ignacio Torre, Distinguished Guests, Ladies and Gentlemen.

It is a real pleasure for Mrs. Anderson and me to be with you this evening in beautiful Long Beach at this gala and festive affair. We appreciate the invitation that was so cordially extended by your good president, "Ike" Torre.

I am especially pleased to be here this evening because I have, I believe, more people from Guam residing in my Congressional District than any other Congressman in the continental United States. My District comprises (roughly) Long Beach on the East—Torrance on the West—The City of Carson (190th Street) on the North—and the islands of Santa Catalina and San Clemente on the South.

President Torre, I want to thank you also, for your kind remarks about H.R. 261, The Asian-American Commission Bill, that Congressman SPARK MATSUNAGA and I introduced. I wish I could give you a good progress report on the bill—but I can't. The Chairman of the Committee to which it has been referred has thus far refused to even give us a hearing on it. However, let's hope we can do better next year.

EVENTUAL STATEHOOD FOR THE ISLANDS OF MICRONESIA

This evening I would like to discuss an issue that I think we will be hearing more and more about as time passes—an issue that I think will be faced in just a few short years—especially as our world grows smaller and smaller, thanks to more advanced technology.

And that issue is eventual statehood for the islands of Micronesia—specifically, Guam and the Marianas.

HISTORY OF GUAM

First let me recite some history of Guam: Ferdinand Magellan made his first landing in the South Pacific on Guam in 1521; then, 44 years later in 1565, Spain claimed the island. And for the next 4 centuries, Guam was governed by Spain.

At the conclusion of the Spanish-American War in 1898, Guam was ceded to the United States together with the Philippines, for the sum of \$20 million. Administration of the island was assigned to the U.S. Navy and

was used mainly as a fueling base for the Navy.

The island fell to the Japanese military forces shortly after Pearl Harbor and was occupied by Japan until 1944, when it was retaken by the Americans. July 21, the day in 1944 when the first American forces landed on Guam, is Liberation Day—one of the island's greatest holidays. That's why we're celebrating the 30th Anniversary of Guamanian Liberation this evening.

Guam continued under Navy jurisdiction until 1950, when President Truman signed the Organic Act of Guam, making Guam a U.S. Territory.

A Civil Governor was appointed in 1950, and military jurisdiction ended.

The Guam of today has a Governor—Carlos Camacho—who was first elected by the people in 1970, and is presently running for re-election. In addition, Guam, with a population of 110,000, has an elected legislature and uses American currency.

HISTORY OF THE MARIANAS

Now, while the history and the culture of the Mariana Islands parallels Guam's, its status is different, in that the Marianas are part of the United States Trust Territory, assigned that status by the United Nations following World War II.

And, as a Trust Territory, the Mariana Islands are administered by the United States under the auspices of the U.N.

A High Commissioner, comparable to a Governor, is appointed by the President, but the legislature is an elected body.

Presently, in an effort to give the people of the Marianas more local control of their own government—and at the same time closer ties with the United States—our government representatives have agreed to grant the Marianas the same status as Guam, that would be a Commonwealth—like Puerto Rico and Guam, with local self-government, American citizenship and permanent affiliation with the United States.

But, to attain this status—

(1) the people of the Marianas must vote for it;

(2) there must be a Congressional approval; and

(3) there must be approval by the United Nations Security Council, with a veto possibility by the U.S.S.R. and or by China.

And, to me, making the Marianas a Commonwealth of the United States makes sense—for both Americans and the people who live on the islands.

For the people of these islands, the plan would assure an infusion of sorely-needed money, development and the perpetual protection of the American Armed Forces.

For the Americans, the arrangement would provide space for enlargement of Pacific military facilities—strategically located—and with great potential for tourism and recreation.

So, it's my hope that this eventually comes about—and then, that the Islands of the Marianas; Guam, Saipan, and Tinian and the others, merge and apply for statehood and become the 51st State of the Union.

MIZELL STATEMENT UPON PRESIDENTIAL RESIGNATION

HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 9, 1974

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, last evening following President Nixon's address to the Nation announcing his resignation I issued a statement which at this time I would like to insert in the Record:

CXX—1744—Part 21

STATEMENT

Richard Nixon has served this Nation faithfully and well throughout his long and often brilliant career.

The personal and national tragedy through which the President and we have passed should never be allowed to overshadow his outstanding accomplishments in the interest of world peace and domestic progress.

His decision to leave office now like so many major decisions he has made in the past serves the best interest of the Nation.

I know my fellow citizens throughout America will join me in a prayer for wisdom for President Ford, compassion for the Nixon family and unity for our country.

TRIBUTE TO SAM STEWART

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 9, 1974

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, on September 1 Sam Stewart will be retiring as editor of the South Bay Daily Breeze.

Three days earlier, on August 28, at the Holiday Inn in Torrance, Sam's many friends and admirers will be joining in sponsorship of a recognition and retirement dinner to say farewell to a great friend and a truly distinguished newspaperman.

Sam Stewart took over the newsroom of the Daily Breeze almost a quarter of a century ago. When he began, the daily circulation was 8,500 and there were six members of the editorial staff. Today, the Breeze is read in more than 78,000 homes each day, and there are 50 members of the editorial staff.

Sam graduated from the University of Colorado and took a job as police reporter for the Colorado Springs Gazette Telegram in 1929. He gradually moved up to the job of managing editor of that newspaper before moving on to become managing editor of the Standard Examiner in 1946.

A three-time winner of awards from the Freedoms Foundation, a four-time winner of Copley Ring of Truth Awards for local editorials, Sam Stewart is a gifted writer as well as an editor. He has by-lined the popular Daily Breeze column "The Bay Window" for more than 18 years.

A former chairman of the Southern California Associated Press News Executive Council, a member of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, the American Press Institute at Columbia University, the Los Angeles Press Club, and the Southwest Press Association, Stewart has been an important participant in the affairs of his profession.

Equally important he has been a concerned and hard working citizen of the South Bay area. He has served on the board of directors of several chambers of commerce, is past president of the Rotary Club of Hermosa Beach, and a former vice chairman of the Redondo Beach Cultural Committee. He was one of the original members of the advisory board of California State College, Dominguez Hills, and a former member of the board of directors of Torrance Hospital.

Sam Stewart, decent, compassionate, honorable, public spirited, is one of the best liked and most respected members of the South Bay community. He has been a major force behind the burgeoning economic and cultural growth of the area in the last quarter of a century.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, it is with special pleasure that I call attention to the dinner honoring Sam Stewart on August 28 when his friends will gather to recall old times and show him something of our profound admiration, gratitude, and respect.

CONSERVATION DISTRICT WINNERS

HON. JOHN P. MURTHA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 9, 1974

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, it is with considerable pride that I congratulate the Indiana County Conservation District on being the first place winner among Pennsylvania districts that competed in the 27th annual Goodyear Conservation Awards program.

I would also like to congratulate Mr. Kenneth Dick, Marion Center, chosen by the district as its outstanding cooperator, and William H. George, Shelecta, member of the district's governing board, who joins in being honored in this awards program.

Also deserving congratulations is the Jefferson County Conservation District chosen as a runnerup in the Goodyear contest, and its outstanding cooperator, Leslie R. Keanry, Brockway.

Mr. Speaker, the Goodyear program recognizes outstanding accomplishments by soil and water conservation districts and their cooperating landowners and landusers.

The Indiana District was cited for planning and management of its natural resources development program.

It is important to note, Mr. Speaker, that conservation districts are locally organized, self-governing bodies chartered by the State. Through voluntary action and cooperation of the landowners, the districts work to conserve land, water, forests, wildlife, and related resources for the benefit of all.

I am very fortunate, Mr. Speaker, in representing the 12th Congressional District of Pennsylvania because it has a very rich history of dedicated conservation efforts by its citizens. Of course, I am also fortunate enough to follow the very respected John P. Saylor in representing that district, and Mr. Saylor's environmental contributions are well-known across the entire Nation.

Moreover, I am fortunate in having organizations like the Indiana and Jefferson County Conservation Districts and the people associated with them who continue the outstanding environmental work in the area.

I thank all of these individuals for their effort. They deserve our praise and support. And I urge them continued success in their efforts to preserve and protect the environment.

THE TRANSPORTATION OF
ANIMALS

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 9, 1974

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the opportunity to testify to a subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee regarding legislation I authored and introduced extending protection to animals being transported and those in retail pet stores. I believe it will be of interest to many Americans and ask that it be included at this point in the Record. The statement follows:

TESTIMONY OF THE HONORABLE G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

Mr. Chairman and distinguished Members of the Committee: I appreciate very much having this opportunity to testify in support of H.R. 1264 and the other bills which I have introduced to amend the Animal Welfare Act of 1970 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the conditions which prevail on common carriers and in their terminals with respect to the treatment of animals being transported. This Committee is to be commended for scheduling these hearings to discuss possible solutions to the serious problems presented by the need for proper care of animals in transit by the nation's common carriers. The Members of this Committee have, over the past several sessions of Congress, demonstrated their concern for the humane treatment of animals by drafting several animal welfare laws, thereby perpetuating the American tradition of protecting animals from inhumane treatment which began with a prohibition against cruelty to animals enacted by the Massachusetts Bay Colony in 1641.

Among the most important laws emanating from the Agriculture Committee have been the Laboratory Animal Welfare Act of 1966 and the Animal Welfare Act of 1970. The 1966 law empowered the Secretary of Agriculture to establish standards for the humane care and housing of animals used in research while in scientific institutions, on the premises of animal dealers, or in transit. The 1970 Act, which I am proud to have sponsored, expanded the coverage of the law to include nonlaboratory animals transported, bought, sold, or exhibited for teaching purposes, for use as pets, or for exhibition in zoos, circuses, or carnivals. Unfortunately, this legislation specifically exempted common carriers from regulation, and the purpose of H.R. 1264 is to close this loophole, as well as another which I shall mention later.

Let me deal first with the matter of common carriers and their terminals. My concern over the treatment of animals in transit, particularly by the airlines, was prompted by scores of letters from my constituents and other citizens throughout the country, who have written to me describing the abuses which their pets have suffered at the hands of the airlines and other common carriers, both in transit and in the terminals. Many of these animals were seriously injured, and even death has resulted in a number of instances. I know that many of my colleagues in the House and Senate have been moved by similar correspondence from constituents, as many Members have sponsored legislation to remedy this problem. 24 Members of the House have agreed to cosponsor H.R. 1264, and Senator Weicker and a number of his colleagues in that body instructed a bill identical to mine shortly after H.R. 1264 was initiated. In addition, the special studies Subcommittee of the Govern-

ment Operations Committee, under the able direction of Congressman Floyd Hicks, held oversight hearings last Fall to determine the severity of the problem of the treatment of animals in transit. The Committee did outstanding investigative work on this matter, and I commend the report of their findings to the Members of this Committee.

I am sure that you will hear from many experts during these hearings who will detail many of the specific problems in the transportation of animals. However, I would like to outline briefly some of the basic deficiencies in the current system which have led me to introduce H.R. 1264. Underlying the entire problem of animal mistreatment in air transportation is the fact the animals are considered cargo. The airlines process animals as general freight, and this has caused animals to be shipped in flimsy containers, left to endure long waits in heated or drafty terminals which contain no specific facilities for animals, and improperly stowed in airplane cargo compartments.

Studies have indicated that animals must contend with great fluctuations in temperature during long flights. Stowed in airplane cargo compartments, animals can be subjected to temperatures ranging from nearly freezing to 90 degrees Fahrenheit or more. In addition, these cargo compartments do not permit an adequate air flow, and consequently the animals suffer from the limited air circulation.

Another problem is that airlines do not provide shipping priority for animals. As a result, animals are rarely booked on direct flights and thereby must often sit for excessive periods of time in overheated or chilly terminals awaiting a flight, many times in containers which are too small, and without adequate food, water, or exercise.

Perhaps the most serious shortcoming of the existing system, and a major cause of death and injury to the animals, is the lack of any government regulations covering the type of container used for animal shipments. Many animals are now shipped in containers which are easily crushed or splintered, and which provide little ventilation or room to maneuver. Indeed, animals are often crowded into far too small a space even to be able to lie down or turn around. Presently most commercial animals are shipped in what is essentially a modified lettuce crate known as the "Bruce" crate. Most veterinarians and others concerned with animal welfare believe that this crate does not meet reasonable container standards.

In many cases, the animals shipped are too young to travel well, and a large percentage die in transit. Further, some are not fully healthy when they are shipped, and latent or existing conditions are exacerbated.

Finally, when the animals reach the terminal to which they have been shipped, there is often a long wait before the consignee is notified of their arrival.

In an effort to reform these practices, several different legislative approaches have been proposed. A major point of contention among those who favor remedial legislation is the question of which federal agency should take the lead in regulating the transportation of animals. The Department of Transportation, the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Aviation Administration, and the Department of Agriculture all have their supporters. In my judgment, there is a need for coordination of effort among all of these agencies, as each has a special kind of expertise which can be brought to bear to contribute to the solution of this problem.

However, I strongly believe that the Department of Agriculture should have the primary regulatory responsibility. The USDA already has the administrative machinery in place for carrying out a program of regulating the common carriers and their terminals and ensuring animal welfare. This regula-

tory program would simply be added to Agriculture's existing responsibilities under the Laboratory Animal Welfare Act of 1966 and the Animal Welfare Act of 1970.

It makes little sense for USDA to regulate the treatment of animals up to the door of the terminal and then turn the responsibility over to another agency once the animals are inside the terminal. If dual jurisdiction is mandated by the Congress, I am convinced that the result would be a duplication of effort and bureaucratic infighting among the agencies involved.

An additional reason for placing the regulatory authority within the Agriculture Department is that, in my judgment, the USDA would be influenced to a lesser degree by the airlines or other common carriers than would such agencies as DOT, the CAB, and the FAA. The primary aim of the Department of Agriculture would be the protection of the animals' welfare, which is, of course, the purpose of this legislation.

Let me now turn briefly to another aspect of H.R. 1264 which, although it has received less publicity, I believe is worthy of your consideration. The Animal Welfare Act of 1970 specifically exempted retail pet shops from regulation. While I feel that "hobby breeders" should receive specific exemption, many abuses take place in the pet shop chains or "puppy mills," which I believe we have a responsibility to try to correct. Thus I would strongly recommend that the 1970 Act be amended by deleting the exclusion of retail pet stores and exempting only the "hobby breeders."

During the course of the hearings, I know that your Committee will hear many heart-rending descriptions of the maltreatment of animals similar to those that I have heard. The lack of temperature control and inadequate air supply in baggage compartments; the use of inadequate, defective, or too-small crates in shipping the animals; the shipment of animals too young or too sick to travel successfully; long waits in terminals, in some cases even without food, water, or exercise; and the general treatment of animals as if they were ordinary inanimate cargo all contribute to the inhumane conditions to which our pets are subjected by the airlines and other common carriers. Many of these problems exist in or are caused by the pet dealers. These hearings will surely help to focus the attention of the Congress and the American people on the problems of animals in transit and elsewhere, and I sincerely hope that they will result in the passage of meaningful remedial legislation.

In a country such as ours, with an outstanding humanitarian tradition, we can not allow the current inhumane treatment of our animals in transit to continue any longer. Let me respectfully urge the Committee to report H.R. 1264 favorably to the full House.

Once again, Mr. Chairman, let me commend you for holding these hearings and for the fine record you have achieved in promoting the welfare of animals. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to present this testimony.

INFLATION IN THE USA

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 9, 1974

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, inflation continues as America's No. 1 domestic problem. The average citizen does not realize what is happening to him but he knows inflation is hurting him and his family.

Let me show you the latest concise

comparison that shows the current impact of inflation. This week's copy of U.S. News has a section headed, "Tomorrow." Under it, this factual comparison was made which shows that people are getting more dollars, yet the dollars are buying less. Read this over a second time because it says a man getting annual income today of \$29,420 has less dollar purchasing power than a man had in 1967 who received \$20,000.

Remember that inflation is primarily caused by excessive congressional overspending. There has been too much buck passing, but the buck stops here. Let us stop spending.

Here is the direct quote from U.S. News & World Report:

Trend since 1967, when inflation began to take off, shows the problem:

Married man with two children and earning \$20,000 in 1967 paid \$2,910 in federal income tax, \$290 in Social Security tax and had \$16,800 left.

Today, assuming pay kept up with inflation, the family would have income of \$29,420, would pay \$5,022 in federal income tax, \$772 in Social Security tax and have \$23,626 left. That would be worth only \$16,061 in 1967 dollars—a loss of more than 4 per cent in what the income is worth after taxes.

INFLATION IS A MAJOR PROBLEM

HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 9, 1974

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, one of the chief causes of our present problem with inflation has been the rising spending of the Federal Government. In order to bring inflation under control, we need to reduce Government spending and eliminate deficit financing. We need to return to the concept of a balanced Federal funds budget. I wish to commend to my colleagues an excellent column by Allan Brownfeld on this subject which appeared in the Phoenix Gazette, June 14, 1974:

GOVERNMENT SPENDS—AND INFLATION GROWS
(By Allan C. Brownfeld)

Despite White House pronouncements that "the worst is behind us" with regard to inflation, the facts seem to tell a different story.

During the first quarter of 1974 the rate of inflation entered the double-digit territory in terms of three important yardsticks: a 10.8 per cent annual rate in the gross national product price deflator, which is the broadest measure of price performance; a 12.2 per cent annual rate in consumer prices, and a 28.8 per cent annual rate in wholesale prices, which is subsequently reflected in higher retail prices.

Rather than receding, the high level of inflation and interest rates is extending the current recession in business activity. The economic consulting firm of Lionel D. Edie and Company, for example, expects that real growth in the gross national product will decline by 1.6 per cent in the second quarter of 1974. Coupled with an estimated 5.8 per cent decline in the first quarter, the economic slowdown this year, according to most economists, clearly rates the title of "recession."

Council of Economic Advisers Chairman Herbert Stein has said that the decline in

the inflation rate in April came because food and energy prices were "slowing sharply" and that greater supplies were becoming available. The administration, he said, had predicted this fact and the inflation is now well under control.

This line of argument assumes that the American people do not understand the real cause of inflation, an assumption which, unfortunately, seems all too accurate. Inflation has not been caused by shortages of food and energy—inflation is caused primarily by government itself, something which government officials—understandably—do not like to admit.

One government official who has seen fit to shed a bit of light upon this subject is Federal Reserve Board Chairman Arthur Burns. Speaking at commencement exercises of Illinois College, Burns declared that "if past experience is any guide, the future of our country is in jeopardy" from inflation. He said that if the "debilitating" inflation continues at anything like present rates, it would "threaten the very foundation of our society."

Burns took sharp issue with the standard administration explanation of the main origins of inflation—that is, skyrocketing food and fuel prices outside its control. Burns placed more emphasis on "awesome" federal spending, a response to "Individuals who have come to depend less and less on their own initiative and more and more on government to achieve their economic objectives."

While Herbert Stein states that the living cost rise will slow to 6 per cent in the fourth quarter, another member of the Council of Economic Advisers, William Fellner, estimates that prices will climb at a rate of 7 to 8 per cent a year in the fourth quarter and will continue to rise at close to that damaging rate throughout 1975. Cost of Living Council Director John Dunlop is even more pessimistic. He told a congressional committee that whether prices will be 10 per cent above 1973 at year end will be a "close thing."

Yet, rather than attempting to cut spending, both the Nixon administration and the Democratic Congress are moving ahead with expensive new spending programs. One example is the proposed national health insurance plan. Both the version supported by the administration and the one supported by Sen. Edward M. Kennedy, D-Mass., would be extremely costly.

Inflation is caused by an artificial increase in the money supply—a form of hidden taxation—and if government does not curb its spending, no easing of our current inflation is possible. The authors of the Constitution were all too aware of the use of paper money as a taxing device, since the Revolutionary War was financed in part by printing such money.

When government seeks to spend money, but knows that it is politically unwise to increase taxes, it simply prints more money, debasing the currency which already exists, and taxes its citizens in this indirect manner. For administration spokesmen to blame the energy crisis and the food shortage for inflation is simply to play upon the economic naivete of most Americans.

WOLFF NEWSLETTER

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 9, 1974

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, periodically, I distribute a newsletter to my constituents in a continuing effort to keep them informed of my activities as their Representative in Washington. And often, I use the newsletter as a vehicle to obtain their views on major issues, thus

allowing me to function more effectively on their behalf on Capitol Hill. I would like to share with my colleagues my latest newsletter:

DEAR FRIEND AND CONSTITUENT: Today, the United States is facing one of the most serious economic problems in its history. The days ahead will be critical for every American.

For those of means, this inflation-ridden economy means uncertainty and could mean financial ruin. For the poor, it means they could be chained forever to a position of dependency. For the middle income family it could mean an end to their level of lifestyle within our society.

We must face up to the seriousness of the problem before we can begin to cure it. No band-aid approach will suffice, neither will rhetoric, jawboning, or the dumping of the burden on the wage earner who has no "special interest" voice in government to watch out for his future. The Administration has not taken the comprehensive and constructive steps necessary to deal with the problem. Instead we are inundated with an endless stream of double-talk advanced by the Administration's Office of Management and Budget. Setting aside 15 cents of every \$10 you have to expend will not stop inflation, nor will it increase the purchasing power of the money-short consumer. This is not the way to recover financially.

To reverse the pattern we are now following, we must end the type of financial gymnastics of phase I which led to phases II, III and IV. We cannot rely on financial manipulations that plug holes at one end of the system and cause breaks along the line. Our record on this point has resulted in the devaluation of the dollar with resulting runaway energy costs and a crumbling of the very foundations of the world's economy.

In numerical terms, this pattern shows us that during the last five years, the Administration has totaled a \$66.9 billion budget deficit. To correct this trend, we must establish a firm, clear and comprehensive policy to include a series of basics that I have been working to have adopted, as positive steps to assure a return to a sound economy.

REDUCE THE FEDERAL DEBT; REORDER OUR PRIORITIES

Do you know that the annual interest on our total national debt of \$468.4 billion is \$30 billion—more than the total amount of all federal government expenditures for the first 125 years of our history? Do you know that this amount of interest (\$30 billion) breaks down to \$49,660 each and every minute? Do you know that in 1974 we spent only \$7.6 billion for educational programs, \$2.3 billion for housing, \$3 billion on crime prevention, \$10 billion on transportation, \$1.5 billion on energy development, \$4 billion on environmental protection—for a total of \$28.4 billion, less than the \$30 billion we pay for interest on the national debt?

To help remove this huge annual payment we can begin by collecting the nearly \$46 billion owed the United States by foreign nations—some of these debts date back to World War I—and my legislation, H. Con. Res. 189, would call in these debts. There is no reason why we should persist in being the world's banker when these nations continue to threaten the dollar and our precious raw materials.

CUT THE FEDERAL BUDGET

To change our spending patterns we must cut excessive federal spending. Only then can we reestablish the "real" value of the dollar. To do this we must not assume an "Atlas" role in relation to the world's economic needs. We must do our share, but we also must insist that other nations do theirs. For instance, the "energy rich" oil producing and exporting countries must be compelled to help the "have not" nations which are being bankrupted by the inflated cost of en-

ergy resources. Additionally, we must revise the present welfare system—one of the greatest financial burdens facing government today—to remove the indolent from the roles so we may better help the indigent who desperately need assistance.

NO MORE FOREIGN "GRAIN DEALS"

Another serious cause of our inflation is the foreign wheat and grain deals that depleted our resources when we could least afford it. The wheat and grain were exported to the Soviet Union and the Peoples Republic of China at "taxpayer subsidized" prices and shipped to them in "taxpayer subsidized" containers at the same time our food supply program cut back on the production capacity of our farmers and created shortages. Is it any wonder prices skyrocketed?

My Export Priorities Act, H.R. 10844, now before the House, would control the export of agricultural commodities until such time as our domestic needs are met at prices the consumer can afford. We must provide food for the American table, in sufficient supply and at reasonable prices, before we ship abroad. Once our needs are met, we can export any surplus to take care of our balance of trade.

ELIMINATE UNNECESSARY DEFENSE SPENDING

We must no longer spend funds on unworkable or on unnecessary defense projects, but only fund programs that contribute to our security. This is common sense. There is no business that could not undertake a 5 percent waste efficiency program, so why not the Defense Department too? Such a waste reduction program would result in a return of \$4.4 billion annually to the Treasury from our bloated defense budget.

REEXAMINE FOREIGN AID POLICY

This means examining the return we are getting on our money. We must be firm with those who receive our aid but plague us with problems. We must suspend aid to such nations until we are assured of their co-operation. A case in point is the non-cooperation of Turkey which reneged on an agreement with the United States to ban the production of opium. Remember, before this ban was imposed, 80 percent of the heroin in the U.S. had its origin in the poppy fields of Turkey and the end cost to the American taxpayer for this heroin abuse was \$27 billion in drug related crimes across the nation.

And, what sense does it make to continue to pour billions of your tax dollars into the bottomless pit of Vietnam to curtail their inflation while our economy is faltering? We are spending \$1.5 billion in foreign assistance programs for Vietnam with \$350 million allocated to stabilize their economy while our inflation soars. And to add insult to injury, the \$250 million sought for tuition and education benefits for our veterans of Vietnam to help them lead full and productive lives is labeled "too inflationary" by the Administration.

I ask you, who is more important to help—to whom do we owe a chance at tomorrow—our American veteran or a corrupt foreign regime?

We in Congress now have the Congressional Budget Reform Act, which I co-sponsored in the House, to provide Congress with the tools it needs to determine national priorities and to equate need with essential spending. In the next issue of my newsletter, I will continue to discuss with you the steps I advocate to re-vitalize our economy—extensive tax reform, an end to evasive tax "loopholes" and a more equitable program of financial support for our NATO forces abroad which now cost us \$14 billion a year. We must balance the scales of supply and demand to protect the consumer from further erosion of his pocketbook by restoring our economic stability before it is too late.

NEWSPAPER PUBLISHER SPEAKS OF BEAUTY OF NEW RIVER

HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 9, 1974

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Ed M. Anderson is a grand lady and a dynamic force in Alleghany and Ashe Counties in North Carolina. Mrs. Anderson is the publisher of two fine newspapers in my district, the Skyland Post and the Alleghany News. I know that she speaks for many of her readers in her strong support of saving the New River in North Carolina and Virginia. Mrs. Anderson's statement before the House Interior Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation is most informative and thoughtful, and I would like to share it with my colleagues:

Mr. Chairman, my name is Mrs. Ed M. Anderson. I live in West Jefferson, Ashe County, North Carolina, and am the publisher of the only newspapers in Ashe and Alleghany Counties, which are threatened with great loss if the Appalachian Power Company is permitted to construct draw-down dams on New River, which flows through these two counties.

In the first place, such a project would be an economic disaster for these two counties as well as Grayson County, Virginia.

According to surveys made earlier, the proposed dams would include 43,000 acres. Take this out of cultivation and it would be a tremendous loss to these three counties. Not only would it reduce income of individuals, but taxes coming into the county.

The economy of this county is based to a large measure on agriculture, livestock and dairying. Such a project would reduce all this and in turn reduce taxes citizens now pay. Such a project would cover schools, churches and cemeteries as well as many homes, upsetting the way of life of people, families, who have lived here for generations.

Dairying, beef cattle, tobacco and truck crops, supply much of the income for people who live in this area. All of this income would be greatly reduced by the good farm land that would be under water.

The Kraft Cheese Plant, which has offered a good market to farmers for 40 years, has indicated that it would not operate the plant here if the milk supply is reduced by the dam. The same reasoning could apply to the local livestock markets, the burley tobacco markets, as well as the bean and vegetable markets which are accessible to farmers of this area.

Many families who have lived here for generations would have to give up their homes and try to find some other place to live.

Aside from the great economic loss to North Carolina many of the citizens from this area, the proposed draw-down dam project would destroy much of the natural beauty of New River and the land through which it flows.

The New River is stocked with game fish and is a paradise for many who come from near and far during the fishing season. It affords ideal campsites along the banks. Canoeists travel by truck with their canoes from as far as Cincinnati to row down New River. All of this will be destroyed if the proposed dams are built.

Some years ago the Army Corps of Engineers surveyed this area and classed it "A", a beautiful and natural recreational area not one that would be ruined by dams.

Asa Gray, well known naturalist, made a survey of this area and described it as one

where the greatest variety of old trees, shrubs and flowers grow, that he had found anywhere in these United States.

We believe in State's rights and do consider it unethical to use North Carolina's resources to furnish sources of power for other states, since we would get nothing from the project destruction. We would not be supplied with power from the proposed dams.

God created a beautiful valley through which New River flows. Will we allow this to be destroyed by drawn-down dams? Will we allow muddy, smelly backs to replace the natural beauty we now have?

ECO-TIPS NO. 7—FOSSIL FUELS

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 9, 1974

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the energy crisis is still with us, and so is our concern for the quality of the environment. Add to it the effects these issues have on our economy and you must conclude that we have here the crucial issues of the day, the issues that deeply concern most Americans. These issues will not come to rest until many more people are better informed about the various options open to them.

In a continuing attempt to encourage national debate on environmental issues, Concern, Inc., has just published the first two sections of its three-part study of energy alternatives. Part I deals with fossil fuels and part II with nuclear energy. Part III, to be published in October, will deal with clean, renewable sources, such as solar and geothermal energy.

I believe that this is a critical time for decisions on energy alternatives. I am convinced that our energy-driven inflation will not come to an end, until we have the will, the means, and the know-how to become self-sufficient.

The Energy Research and Development Administration—ERDA—will have to play a leading role toward this national objective. In my considerable effort to bring ERDA to fruition I have never failed to stress the need for parity in the development of our fossil fuels, especially coal, and the promise of nuclear power. To help us and others to reach a more balanced view about these two large reservoirs of energy and their effects on the environment, I insert these two brief summaries prepared by Concern, Inc., into the RECORD:

ECO-TIPS No. 7—ENERGY ALTERNATIVES

PART I: FOSSIL FUELS

"The production and consumption of energy is the major source of environmental degradation . . . The more energy we consume, the greater the burden on our air, our water, our land, and our health."

RUSSELL PETERSON,

Chairman, Council on Environmental Quality.

This is a critical time for decisions on energy alternatives. Decisions are being made now which will affect the quality of life for ourselves and for future generations.

Do individuals have a role to play in this decisionmaking process? We say emphatically—yes! First we must become informed

about the energy problems and challenges that face us, including our need to conserve. Then we can act by electing responsive public officials, informing them of our views on energy alternatives, and participating in public forums. In so doing, we will create an open dialogue on our nation's energy future.

All forms of energy degrade the environment in varying degrees. We will analyze the environmental and health effects of each source of supply. Are the environmental effects of some sources so critical that we should not risk their development? Is the cost escalation of present energy supplies now making new sources of energy, once thought exotic, a possibility for the near future? Can we set as a viable national goal the supplying of our nation's energy with clean, renewable energy sources by the year 2000?

The concept of energy alternatives implies choices, and we will explore these choices in this three-part Eco-Tips series. We will discuss all major forms of energy: fossil fuels, nuclear, solar, and geothermal.

FOSSIL FUELS

Ninety-five percent of the energy consumed today in the United States is derived from our fossil fuels—that is, from natural gas, oil or coal. These resources are stored by nature beneath the earth's surface and must be removed by drilling into the earth or, in the case of some coal and oil shale deposits, stripped from the earth's surface. Ecological damage occurs in the mining or stripping process and when the fuels are burned.

GAS

Natural Gas is our cleanest fuel. Little environmental damage is done by extracting or distributing gas and no appreciable air pollution is caused by its burning. Currently natural gas supplies 32% of our energy. Unfortunately, our supply of natural gas is severely limited. If no additions are made to our present reserves, our supply will last only 12 to 14 years. If new sources are tapped, our supply could be stretched to 24 years. After the year 2000, the future for natural gas looks dim. To use the remainder of this resource wisely:

Natural gas should be allocated to areas of dense population on a priority basis;

Natural gas should not be burned for the generation of electricity nor for any industrial uses where coal or oil, with pollution controls, could be used.

Synthetic Gas can be derived from the gasification of coal. Steam and coal react at high temperatures to produce raw gas which must be upgraded. The result is a pollution-free product. However, sulfur oxide emissions and water pollution (from washing of the coal) are serious problems incurred in the process. Gas from coal could be produced in significant quantities within a decade, if the process can be made financially feasible.

PETROLEUM

Oil is the fossil fuel resource in the greatest demand today. We produce more oil than other fossil fuels but currently the U.S. is able to supply only 3.5 billion of the 6 billion barrels which we consume annually. Oil consumption represents 46% of our total energy use.

Oil drilling on land has not caused major environmental concern, although it has been highly inefficient—leaving about 70% of the oil in the ground. Secondary and tertiary recovery can increase production of previously tapped sources.

Serious environmental problems can result from offshore oil drilling (which is continually moving into deeper and more hazardous waters); from extracting oil from shale; from transporting oil by supertanker and by underwater pipeline from superports, and by overland pipeline, through fragile areas.

In its burning for industrial uses and in

the generation of electricity, oil is more polluting than natural gas. Serious pollution from the burning of oil also occurs when it is used as gasoline for motor vehicles. Currently 27% of the oil we consume annually goes for this purpose.

Low-sulfur oil is reasonably clean when burned for the heating of homes and buildings, for the generating of electricity and for industrial uses.

High-sulfur oil should be desulfurized if it is to be burned as a fuel.

Pollution controls on motor vehicles are essential to human health until efficient clean-burning engines are developed.

Oil and Gas from the Outer Continental Shelf are found in deposits beneath the ocean floor in the Atlantic, the Pacific, the Gulf of Alaska and the eastern Gulf of Mexico. The technology for extracting these deposits has been practiced for many years in the Gulf of Mexico where weather conditions are less treacherous than in the other ocean areas. Recently, the federal government increased by tenfold the available acreage for offshore drilling leases. The areas now extends anywhere from shore to 200 miles at sea and will open up areas in the Atlantic, Pacific, and Gulf of Alaska. Environmental disadvantages of offshore drilling include:

Oil spills which dirty recreational beaches, kill birds and fish and destroy estuary breeding grounds;

Debris from construction, maintenance and dismantling which would play havoc with commercial fishing operations;

Introduction of polychlorinated biphenyls (PCB's), a deadly chemical comparable to DDT, to the marine environment;

Threat to estuarine environment from pipelines to coastal refineries;

Unsightly structures (4,300 drilling rigs off Louisiana in 1972);

Land use impact which follow from offshore operations (refineries, storage tank farms and auxiliary industries).

Oil Shale resources in the U.S. are probably double our proven petroleum reserves and the technology for producing oil from shale is considered economically feasible. However, the enormous quantities of water needed for this process will probably keep us from fully developing this source of supply. A fully developed oil shale industry could drain 121,000 to 189,000 acre feet of water per year from the Colorado River. This water would become so dirtied that it could not be returned to the river. Other environmental damages would include:

Deterioration of water quality from increased salinity;

Air pollution from solid particulates during mining, and from stack gases in the retort and refining process;

The use of canyons as dumping areas for tailings (waste after the oil is removed from shale), which would destroy animal habitats, plant life and scenic landscapes;

Subsidence of mountains, which have been blasted from within, when pillar supports deteriorate in 20 to 100 years.

Synthetic Oil can be derived from the liquefaction of coal. Hydrogen is made to react with coal to form synthetic oil. A ton of coal can produce 2 to 3 barrels of oil. Problems are similar to those listed for coal gasification.

COAL

Coal is our most abundant energy resource. Our reserves could supply our needs for hundreds of years. Unfortunately, it is the most environmentally damaging fuel to extract and the most polluting fuel to burn. Stack gas cleaners (scrubbers) can lessen this pollution. Coal provides 17% of our energy supply at present but this figure could increase sharply as we run into greater shortages of oil and gas.

DEEP MINING

Over 90% of our coal reserves are deposited deep in the earth and require deep mining for removal. Although this method presents the least damage to the land, it involves the workers in a very hazardous occupation, and causes water pollution from acid mine drainage. Some measures to lessen the hazards of deep coal mining include:

Increased research to improve deep mine technology;

Additional mechanization of industry to lessen the number of hazardous jobs;

Adequate compensation to workers for black lung disease and accidents, even if this should result in a higher cost of coal to the purchaser;

Monitoring of mines to control sulfuric acid leached from exposed coal seams.

STRIP MINING

Slightly more than 8% of our coal reserves lie near the surface of the earth and can be removed by stripping away the rock and soil strata and then surface mining the ore deposits. This provides safe working conditions but results in serious degradation of the land and water. Surface mined areas on slopes greater than 20° cannot be reclaimed, nor can land where the annual rainfall is 10" or less. Much stripminable coal lies under valuable farm land.

A ban should be placed on strip mining any land which cannot be reclaimed.

All land that is allowed to be stripped must be reclaimed, and the costs of reclaiming stripped land should be assumed by industry.

The burning of coal, especially high-sulfur coal, creates serious air pollution which can cause respiratory illnesses, cardiac problems, lung cancer and genetic effects. It is estimated by the American Public Health Association that the conversion of 46 power plants in the eastern corridor from oil to coal (now being considered) could increase the death rate from respiratory and cardiovascular diseases by as much as 40%, unless adequate measures are taken to control stack emissions. Scrubbers on the stacks of coal-burning plants would reduce dangerous sulfur oxide emissions.

Conversion from oil to coal burning power plants should not be permitted unless stack gas emissions controls are employed.

Low sulfur coal should be allocated to areas of dense population on a priority basis.

Research into desulfurization must be intensified.

Research into the complete combustion process for burning coal should be expanded. (This process is being demonstrated in Sweden.) Incomplete combustion in the burning of coal creates the threat of lung cancer.

Since fossil fuels, primarily coal, will be the backbone of our energy supply through the end of this century and beyond, the problems of their production and use must be solved.

ENERGY CONSERVATION

Considering the adverse environmental and health effects resulting from the present methods of production and use of energy, it becomes essential that our nation embark upon a thorough program of energy conservation. The less energy we demand, the greater freedom we will have in choosing among our sources of supply.

Reductions in energy use can decrease the nation's yearly energy growth rate in the next ten years from its present 4.5% to 1.7%. Reductions would be aimed primarily at eliminating wasted energy and would not be in conflict with our achievement of a high standard of living. Energy conservation will allow our country to buy time until clean, renewable energy sources become available on a larger scale. These sources will be the subject of part three of this Eco-Tips series.

OPTOMETRIC SEMINAR

HON. JAMES W. SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 9, 1974

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Public Health Subcommittee, I share the concern of our able chairman, PAUL ROGERS, and other subcommittee members for the Nation's health personnel needs. This month our Health Subcommittee considers legislation to extend Public Laws 92-157 and 92-158 which authorize assistance to nursing, medical, dental, pharmacy, podiatry, and optometry schools. Certainly, all these schools and their students warrant Federal assistance if the Nation is to meet ever-increasing demands for better health care.

One example of the contributions America's health care professionals make to improving our medical system is a recent optometric seminar designed to inform concerned professionals of the challenges facing urban-based optometrists. At this point, I insert in the RECORD an excellent article detailing vision care opportunities and needs in the central cities:

[From the American Optometric Association News, May 1, 1974]

AOA SEMINAR ASKS URBAN ODS TO USE NEW OPPORTUNITIES

Downtown practitioners from Missouri and Illinois attending the fifth in a series of seven AOA seminars for urban optometrists April 17 at the University of Missouri-St. Louis were told by AOA Executive Director J. Harold Bailey that the early prominent urban ODs first forgot AOA, and consequently AOA forgot the urban practice.

The seminars, organized by the AOA Committee on Urban Optometry, are intended to help the OD who is struggling to maintain a professional practice in the lower-income and higher-overhead setting of inner cities.

In previous years the seminars offered basic continuing education to encourage a full-scope optometric service by the city OD. The current round of seminars deal with third-party influences on the volume and income of an optometric practice.

Industrial vision programs and children's screenings were discussed by University of Houston optometry Prof. Lorance W. Harwood, O.D.

Optometrists who start with an arrangement to provide safety eyewear fittings of basic screenings at a plant can work into environmental survey or research and development roles, Dr. Harwood said. However, ODs should avoid becoming a "supply house" for eyewear.

Dr. Harwood also spoke as part of a panel on children's vision needs and school screening programs. Other panelists were AOA Professional Development Division director George Milkie, O.D., and Committee on Urban Optometry chairman Robert Johnson, O.D., of Chicago.

Dr. Milkie reviewed the lay-to-professional levels of school screening programs and how AOA has worked with school groups to advocate optometric consultation in screenings.

Dr. Johnson said he is now assembling data from his Plano Child Development Center that prove poverty children perform better as a consequence of optometric vision therapy.

The nonprofit optometric center as an adjunct to urban optometry was discussed by Ronald J. Knox, O.D., president of St. Louis Optometric Center and John W. Richards,

O.D., president of Kansas City's Lions Optometric Center.

Both agreed that optometric centers represent an asset, rather than competition for urban ODs. They said optometric centers can:

Provide specialized services on a referral basis.

Serve as the nucleus for optometric participation in health maintenance organizations (HMOs).

Provide ethical practice opportunities for new graduates or veteran city practitioners whose individual practice are declining.

Vision needs of the elderly, who comprise a disproportionate share of urban populations, were discussed by Burton Skuza, O.D. of Minneapolis, a member of the AOA Community Health Division executive committee.

Dr. Skuza said that a mobile vision clinic or a "house call" capability is important to cope with the prevalence of severe visual handicaps among old people confined to institutions.

Paul Saunders, director of the Elizabeth Courtney Health Center in St. Louis, talked about the effect of HMOs and other group practice systems in big cities.

These non-hospital health delivery organizations usually seem "set up to meet the needs of the health professional rather than the patient," Saunders commented.

He said that group vision care plans attempting to provide for an urban population must avoid "pricing yourself out of the market," but on the other hand, not price services so low that the organization would be economically strapped.

Availability of grants to finance vision care projects was discussed by Dean Drullas of AOA's federal relations staff in Washington.

University of Missouri government programs advisor Tom Vonderhaar spoke at a final luncheon general session, reviewing the current decision-making structure in cities and how health professionals must work with it.

In a related development, I am happy to report Missouri optometrists are meeting these inner city health care problems. The Missouri General Assembly has recently appropriated \$50,000 for planning and development of a new school of optometry to serve the St. Louis area. I commend the hard work of the Missouri Association and their leaders, Drs. Jerry Franzel and Bob Mobley.

IMPEACHMENT/WATERGATE ISSUE**HON. BILL FRENZEL**

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 9, 1974

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, I insert the following:

To Those Corresponding on the Impeachment/Watergate Issue.
From Bill Frenzel

Because you have communicated with me regarding impeachment, I am sending you this final update. Federal laws prohibit franked mass mailings in my District after the weekend of August 10. To conform to both the letter and spirit of that law, I will not send further unsolicited updates. But, of course, your calls and letters, which are encouraged, will be answered individually.

When the President made his August 5th statement on his personal coverup activities as revealed in the undelivered tape of June 23, 1972, and others, the question of impeachment for the House of Representatives

was answered. On that day, I made the following statement to the Minnesota press:

"The President has, in effect, pleaded guilty to Impeachment Article I and probably Article II as well. I will continue to analyze the Articles and the evidence to determine my vote on each Subparagraph, but there is no longer any reason to prolong House action nor to indulge in lengthy television debate. Our clear duty now is to vote for impeachment as soon as possible so the Senate can begin the trial promptly."

Nevertheless, I want to detail how I have approached the impeachment question and how I am analyzing the Articles. I believe it is important to continue the process and put all the details carefully on the record so the precedents will be clear for the future.

I have carefully examined each Subparagraph in the Judiciary Committee's Impeachment Articles to determine its "impeachability" and the evidence supporting it. I expect to continue this process, but absent dramatic new evidence, I shall vote at least for Articles I and II. I expect the House debate to include motions to strike some of the Subparagraphs. I hope that the enclosed copy of the Articles and some of my thoughts on them may be helpful to those who follow the House debates on television.

Prior to the President's revelations of August 5th, I had felt that I would probably vote for Article I, mostly on the basis of Subparagraphs 4, 6 and 7, which I perceive to be particularly strong. I had also felt that I would probably have supported Article II based mainly on Subparagraphs 1 and 2. I questioned whether the charge in Article I, Subparagraph 8, even though it is a deplorable practice, constitutes an impeachable offense.

Prior to the President's revelations, I was undecided about Subparagraphs 1, 2, 3, 5 and 9 of Article I, and about Subparagraphs 3, 4 and 5 of Article II.

The President's statement has helped me resolve questions on specific Subparagraphs. I believe the President has literally pleaded guilty to Subparagraphs 1, 2, 3, 4, 6 and 8 of Article I and Subparagraphs 4 and 5 of Article II. Because of the previously-available evidence backing these Subparagraphs, I might have voted for them anyway, but the President has substantiated them himself. His statement has simply made the case "beyond reasonable doubt."

I believe Articles I and II are technically in order. I think an impeachable offense need not be a felony, but, if not, it ought to be a serious crime, or more specifically a serious offense against the political system. The charges contained in Articles I and II, except for Subparagraph 8 of Article I, meet that standard.

Article III, standing alone, is—in my view—not an impeachable offense. The Committee had the option to go to court. Defiance of a Supreme Court order would be impeachable. Also, if the Senate demanded evidence after the House impeached, and the President did not comply, noncompliance would be impeachable.

I believe it might be more reasonable if Article III were made part of another Article—for example, Article I, as suggested by Congressman Cohen on television.

Standing alone, this Article would create a dangerous precedent. I will be relying heavily in my final determination on this Article on the opinions of my colleagues on the Judiciary Committee, even though my inclination is to vote against it at present.

On the evidence, I apply the test of "clear and convincing." Each Member, in the end, has to apply his or her own standards, but the record should, for purposes of precedent, clearly state what those standards are. I believe that the evidence for impeachment should certainly be greater than "probable cause," but—for the House—can be less than "beyond reasonable doubt."

I have worked long and hard in reaching

my decision. Some of my various activities includes, or will include:

1. Review of the 40 volumes of Judiciary Committee material.
2. Examination of evidence and briefs submitted by the President's counsel.
3. Listening to Judiciary Committee tapes.
4. Meetings with Committee staff and Mr. St. Clair.
5. Meetings with Judiciary Committee Members.
6. Review of the Judiciary Committee Report (as yet unpublished).
7. Review of thousands of communications received from people like you.

The House's responsibility is now both clear and urgent. We should move immediately to impeach the President. The current schedule calls for beginning debate on August 19th and terminating on or before the 23rd with television coverage. Since time is of the essence, and since nearly all House Members have made their determination, there is no reason to wait.

The following comments on other aspects will not answer all questions, but they may be informational and may stimulate further questions which I will be glad to receive:

1. **Resignation**—I believe that resignation is the prerogative of the President. I can't stop him from resigning if he desires. On the other hand, I know that the House obligation is to move ahead on impeachment. Resignation is a possibility, but it is not one that I am promoting at this time. I think impeachment is far more appropriate, and is the clear duty of the House. We should be concerned only with discharging our own obligation. The record should be made, so we have, in a clear, single source, all the research and opinions on this matter.

2. **Immunity**—Most Congressmen, including myself, believe that it is probably unconstitutional and probably inappropriate, for us to grant immunity from prosecution to the President. Clemency, immunity or amnesty have traditionally been the province of the Executive, and at this time I am not recommending that the Congress involve itself in that matter.

3. **Supreme Court Ruling**—I have previously commended the 8-0 decision of the Supreme Court which required the President to turn over tapes to the Judge for transfer to the Special Prosecutor. The decision was unanimous; it was unambiguous, it was definitive; and it was right. It acknowledges the need for privileged communication in the Executive Department, but made that need secondary to other important constitutional considerations such as due process of law.

At the risk of extending an already too-lengthy communication, I would add the personal note that the search for truth on the Watergate matter has been arduous and unpleasant. But, it has been necessary. Whether the President had been innocent or guilty, and however he would have been judged, I believe that it was essential to the continuing vitality of our Republic that the process be completed.

I hope, too, that the heroes in the episode will not be forgotten. Richardson, Ruckelshaus, Shultz, Thrower, Walters, Byrne, Sirica are only the most prominent of the public officials who refused to back down from strongly-held personal beliefs. The abuses were horrible, but there were many acts of heroism, too. The work of the Ervin Commission, the two Special Prosecutors and the House Judiciary Committee was necessary to discharge the constitutional responsibilities here. Depending on the weight of the evidence, the country could have withstood any determination as long as there was a determination. It now seems evident that the President will be impeached and that he will be judged guilty by the Senate unless he resigns. It is my hope that we all have learned something from both the abuse and the process. I hope we take at least some minimum comfort (I do) from the fact that the

process, however slow, could eventually produce a determination in which most Americans can concur.

Yours very truly,

BILL FRENZEL,
Member of Congress.

YOUTH CAMP SAFETY

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 9, 1974

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, another summer has come and almost gone and still children are being sent to camps about which their parents know very little. Again children are being placed in situations that hold many latent dangers that certainly are not shown in the colorful brochures or are even noticeable to the untrained eye of the well-meaning parent.

I have held hearings on the Youth Camp Safety Act in the 90th, 91st, 92d, and 93d Congresses that have proved the great need for this legislation. Next week the Select Subcommittee on Labor will meet to mark up the current bill and prepare it for full committee consideration.

I am very pleased to know that the esteemed Senator from Minnesota, WALTER F. MONDALE, has introduced a similar bill in the Senate and that his Subcommittee on Children and Youth has also completed hearings which are again showing the severity of the problem being faced. I would like to commend the Senator for his commitment and intensive work in this area.

I believe that the following article shows once again the importance of your camp safety regulations.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, July 17, 1974]

ONE TEACUP AT A TIME

(By Bill Gold)

An ocean of words washes over newspaper editors each day as they scan incoming dispatches. Their task is to distill it into teacups of information that can be passed along to subscribers whose time is limited.

This week, for example, Sen. Walter F. Mondale (D-Minn.) convened his Senate Subcommittee on Children and Youth to hear testimony on the Youth Camp Safety Act.

This is a measure that would, if enacted, set federal safety standards for the camps to which millions of parents send their children.

Staff writer Richard E. Rotman was sent to Capitol Hill to cover the hearings, and returned to write a fact-packed report for the next day's paper. He was allotted space enough to give the essence of what the legislation would do, what the situation is now, who testified and what was said. It was a "hard news" report on what happened.

What Rotman had no space to tell, and what there is seldom space enough to include in a news dispatch, was a book-length background of detail. Yet to understand why safety standards are being proposed for youth camps, one needs to know that testimony was given that:

Youngsters are in some instances packed into ancient multiple-story hotels without fire alarms, fire escapes, or emergency exits. When fires broke out in facilities of this kind in "New Hampshire, New York, Pennsylvania and elsewhere," deaths resulted.

In California, 62 children and eight leaders were transported for a 200-mile trip over a

high speed highway in an open tractor-trailer truck driven by a young counselor. Five were killed and all the others injured.

The witness who gave this testimony was Mitch Kurman, whose young son had drowned in an earlier camp "accident." Kurman testified that he sent a check to California authorities for an official report on the highway tragedy; his check was returned and he was informed that "this information is not available to the public."

Children from a Long Island camp were sent to visit Pennsylvania "in a bus with faulty steering" driven by "a driver whose license had been revoked for previous violations." Seven died and 52 were injured.

One camp had a 15-year-old part-time dishwasher and part-time "instructor" in charge of its rifle range. When a young camper's rifle jammed, the instructor took over the rifle in an attempt to fix it. The young camper was shot in the abdomen.

Youths at another camp were permitted to float down a swift river in inner tubes with counselors who were "untrained in life-saving and resuscitation techniques."

The children were not given lifejackets. One child became entangled in a fallen tree in the water, and began to drown. When a counselor was asked what she did when she saw the girl drowning, she said, "I screamed." Asked what she did next, she said, "I cried." The child died.

Fifteen children were left in the care of a 15-year-old "counselor-in-training" at one camp. It was testified that the 15-year-old "used a hoe handle as a bat to strike the eye of a camper and blind him." The parents of the child were ignored by camp authorities for eight months. Only when the parents filed suit did the camp file a report with the state health department. The law requires that a report be filed within two days—but there is no penalty for late filing.

The testimony went on for hours. There is no space to print it all, and you wouldn't have time to read it all. But even without reading a word of it, we have long known the basic facts.

We have known that children at camp have been beaten, injured, crippled, blinded, sexually molested, drowned and killed in accidents and fires. We know that there are no federal standards (and adequate state standards in only six jurisdictions) covering the safety of buildings, electrical wiring, equipment or vehicles. We know that although some camp operators voluntarily maintain rigid safety standards, others do not, and no federal law requires them to adhere to any level of training or competence for their employees.

If there are no federal standards, how is a parent to know which camp is safe? The Youth Camp Safety Act has been studied, debated, pigeonholed, and studied again—all without affirmative action—for two chief reasons. Nobody likes to be regulated, and camp operators are no exception. More pertinent, perhaps, is this: camp owners are campaign contributors, and Congress has been catering to their wishes rather than to the wishes of the millions of parents who send their children to camp.

POSTSCRIPT

I'm reminded of George Jean Nathan's observation: "Bad officials are elected by good citizens who do not vote."

MUST WE BE DENIED THE NATIONAL GEOGRAPHIC PROGRAMS?

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 9, 1974

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much the combination of television

network reluctance, Federal Communication Commission entanglements, and the commercialism which dominates much of our broadcasting that threatens to keep the important National Geographic Society programs off the airwaves this coming season.

I want to make it plain at the outset that commercialism is vital to the networks which must cater to mass tastes in order to attract the big audiences necessary to gain the advertising money which keeps them going. But it is a deplorable situation, nevertheless.

The National Geographic specials were both educational and interesting to those willing to skip the detective shows and comedy series to turn them on. They did much in recent years, I am sure, to inform us of remote parts of the world and the ways of the people who live there. Also, they allowed us to keep abreast of the ongoing research in archeology, anthropology, and other subjects which seldom make the front pages.

Now, according to news reports, the American people are to be denied these programs. And the reason? According to Associate Press television writer Jay Sharbutt it rests in a recent Federal court decision which ordered the FCC to delay until September 1975 revisions it had made in its prime time access rule.

The revisions would have increased by 90 minutes a week the evening time which each network could have on local stations. This would have meant, I gather from Mr. Sharbutt's report, a "cushion" for a network in which it could have weathered a listener falloff in putting on the National Geographic and other programs that do not receive the top ratings.

I quote from Mr. Sharbutt's dispatch: Because of the court order, CBS, which had planned to air six half-hour National Geographic specials on Saturdays, said it was forced to drop the programs from its 1974-75 schedule.

This, according to Mr. Sharbutt, was the second setback suffered this year by National Geographic in its efforts to use TV to reach the U.S. public. Earlier ABC, which had aired the society's specials last season, failed to renew its contract for the same reason that caused CBS to step aside.

In my judgment, this not only is a bad break for millions of Americans who have watched these programs, but also an unfortunate turn of events for youngsters who on Saturday may have been drawn to the programing that CBS originally had planned. I know of nothing on TV more educational or likely to stir up youthful interest in the subjects which National Geographic deals—an interest that could last a lifetime.

I need not recall the heavy hopes which all of us had when the so-called age of television came upon us. We saw not only a happy medium to keep us entertained as we slumped in our chairs before the "magic screen" after our day's work was done. But we saw also that this fantastic thing could keep us better informed and, indeed, educated about the world in a way hitherto impossible.

It is fair to say now that TV has filled the entertainment promise. It, too, has

developed news reports which have Americans knowing much more about their Government and public affairs than any generation could have known before. But, with the exception of the "Sesame Streets" and other such daytime programs on public TV, the education promise has not been met as was expected.

For this reason, I protest the conditions which turned off the networks on the programs which National Geographic already has prepared and those which could be kept coming on regular schedule indefinitely. Who knows—perhaps in time these presentations could have brought an audience as great as those now enjoyed by the "private eyes" and "sit comedies." They deserved at least this chance.

"National Geographic," AP writer Sharbutt says, "has given some thought to syndicating its shows to local stations or to public television if suitable arrangements could be made there." Each program, however, costs at least \$180,000 to produce and this must be met by income. I think Congress should look into this matter and give weight it can to getting these programs on the air. It is interesting to me that Canada has signed up National Geographic for the new TV season. Why should our people be denied the fine programs which will continue to be available to Canadians?

NIXON'S RETREAT BEHIND THE WALLS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 9, 1974

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as we welcome our old friend, Gerry Ford, as 38th President of the United States, I believe we should objectively analyze some of the reasons why many of the problems accumulated that made it necessary for President Nixon to resign. One of the news men who has been maintaining a great degree of objectivity throughout the long difficult Watergate controversy is Bob Wiedrich of the Chicago Tribune. I insert his column of August 8, at this point.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Aug. 8, 1974]

NIXON'S RETREAT BEHIND THE WALLS

(By Bob Wiedrich)

Richard Nixon shut his door to the free flow of differing opinion during his White House tenancy. And therein may lie the real cause of his present dilemma.

That is the thesis advanced by some who have become knowledgeable of the techniques of the Nixon Presidency since his election to a first term in 1968.

Instead of seeking counsel from a broad range of views, wherever he could find it, Nixon appeared to retreat more and more behind the wall of executive isolation erected by his trusted aides, H. R. Haldeman and John Ehrlichman.

Without a doubt, these two controlled access to the Oval Office, so much so they came to be called the Palace Guard. It is a question, however, whether they controlled it because they were strong or because the President wanted it that way.

Certainly, Nixon furnished a clue when

he wrote, in describing his concept of the Presidency, that a chief executive should be given time to think things out, leaving the detail and trivia to his staff.

In any event, former cabinet members such as George Romney, Walter Hickel, and, to a lesser extent, Melvin Laird, sought vainly to penetrate that wall and failed.

So in time, they went away. And the President was denied whatever value their counsel might have availed him in reaching judgments.

Further, there are those who believe once Nixon ascended to office he ceased to have time for the opinions of others. He cared little of what his critics said. He failed to consider the views of those who might disagree with him. He often reduced criticism to a personal thing.

He almost appeared to regard himself as the consummate politician who had all the answers and needed no advice after having pulled himself from the ashes of two defeats to become President.

Thus, the door to the Oval Office closed tighter.

On June 23, 1972, when Haldeman brought up the problems posed by the Watergate burglary six days earlier, Nixon apparently had no one else to turn to for advice and counsel, no one who could offer an alternative course out of that dilemma.

Reading the transcript of the White House tape in which it is decided to use the CIA to divert the FBI from its probe of the break-in, one easily can get the impression Haldeman is calling all the shots.

In this instance, it appears he is de facto President and Nixon is just there for the ride. Nixon's responses are virtually all in agreement. He asks a few questions. But Haldeman is clearly in command.

There is no one else there to say, "Hey, wait a minute, Buster! What you're proposing to the President is obstruction of justice. That's a felony for which you both could be jailed!"

There is no opposing view available to Nixon. There are no words of caution, of interpretation of the grievous consequences of this decision. All there sounds is the fatal litany of Haldeman as he advises a course of action no man sworn to uphold the Constitution should ever entertain.

From the testimony and evidence to date, it is clear Nixon left the domestic and political front, for the most part, to Haldeman and Ehrlichman while he concerned himself with foreign affairs.

Granted, his first term became one of great events on that front.

He achieved a dialogue with Red China and Soviet Russia. He reached an accord in Southeast Asia that was to lead to the withdrawal of United States troops. He brought an end to rioting in the streets of America.

Meanwhile, however, he left affairs at home in the hands of Haldeman and Ehrlichman, two men with the amateur political expertise of a couple of campaign advance men. Sadly, they also appear to have been men who viewed politics as a game with different rules of morality.

Witness the bland manner with which Haldeman proposes the commission of a crime without apparently batting an eyelash.

It is unfortunate that President Nixon did not heed the words of the late House Speaker Sam Rayburn, who observed after meeting President Kennedy's staff:

"They're bright young men. But I'd feel better if one of them had run for sheriff."

In essence, Rayburn was saying that one only is competent to grasp the reins of power after getting the sense of American politics thru exposure to the grass roots. You've got to face the voters, man to man.

Nixon had endured that crucible. Haldeman and Ehrlichman never had.

That is the sad judgment of many who have observed the Nixon Presidency. The

people did not elect him President for foreign affairs, however magnificent has been his performance there. They elected him President of the United States.

But he abdicated a part of his duties to rank, power-hungry amateurs. And in doing so, may have become architect of his own destruction.

PITTSBURGH NEIGHBORHOOD CLEANUP PROGRAM

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 9, 1974

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, precious little attention is given to those citizens working in their own neighborhoods to overcome the problems of slums, blight, and deterioration.

David R. Hall, founder and primary force behind the Clean Communities Association of Pittsburgh, is one of these outstanding citizens.

Dave Hall has been trying to make his community of Homewood-Brushton, in Pittsburgh, a better place to live through a coordinated clean, plant up campaign.

With little more than the will to improve the neighborhood environment, Dave Hall has reaped near miracles and moved local citizens to take positive actions they might not ever have considered had it not been for his perserverance.

I include in the RECORD at this time an article from the Pittsburgh Press on Dave Hall and commend him for his contributions to our city.

The article follows:

DYNAMO URGES A WPA TO CLEAN UP GHETTOS (By Sylvia Sachs)

"Simplicity, continuity, follow-up, these are what we need," says David R. Hall, his voice rising with each word until he is almost shouting.

Hall is the one-man dynamo behind a project in the Homewood area known as Clean Community Association Inc. Basic to all his ideas is the creation of a work force patterned after the WPA of the Depression era.

He bursts with ideas to help the inner city ghettos. He pops off in many directions, but always gets back to the same three points.

CITES GHETTO LIFE

You start at the grassroots, Hall says. You get the people in a community mobilized to clean up, paint up, fix up their own area. Not only the homes but the businesses, he says, and you will help the employment situation while instilling pride in the people.

"You have to let the government people know where to put their money," Hall declares. "A lot of well-meaning people in all these scattered agencies and departments have these big long-range plans. Yet, if you live in the ghetto, you can't get through the streets for the garbage.

"Why can't the Hill be clean and green until they decide what they're going to build there? If I was in City Council, I would put a moratorium on everything until the place was cleaned up.

"All those groups don't get anything done. You've got to do something physically. Everybody who gets government money has on a shirt and tie."

Hall has been hooked on this simplicity start with the little guy attitude since 1963 when he and some neighbors organized Clean Communities. It was chartered as a

nonprofit agency in 1968 and has been struggling since to keep alive.

THEY CLEAN UP BASE

Headquarters of the association, and Hall's pride, is a three block area of Homewood which he and people he organized cleared of rubble four years ago.

He calls it the Environmental Community Park Work Base. It includes flower beds, receptacles for garbage and rubbish (so individual truckers hired to clean up don't dump stuff back into neighborhood alleys), and an outdoor storage area.

"You need a headquarters for environmental work," Hall says. "This is the place. We had a pick and shovel from the start, and we stay with them."

Hall doesn't fault the goodwill of various government and private agencies (garden clubs, educational groups) who come to the ghetto with projects. But he says they do one-shot things like an art show or a planting program, then take off never to be heard from again.

Continuity of effort and followup is lacking, he says.

"The business sections of the inner city are ignored," Hall continued. "If someone rides through a street like that (gesturing toward Homewood Avenue), and they see the stores closed and 'the cats' sitting around, no wonder they head for the suburbs.

"This nation was built around the business districts of the cities. Why isn't something continuous done about basic things like that?"

WRITES PAMPHLET

He believes the unemployed, released prisoners, other uncommitted and under-used persons could be put to cleaning and upgrading ghetto areas.

Hall mortgaged his home to print a pamphlet stating his ideas and how they could be implemented. Called "How to Beautify the Ghettos," the book was written by Hall with the hope he could raise funds for association projects.

He also hopes to get some action from "the cats with the money" to green the ghettos and get some help for individuals who have to live there.

Hall sent copies of his book to government officials, local, national and international. He is waiting to see if any of them are stirred up enough to help.

One "cat with the money" said his agency sympathizes with Hall but added, "agencies like this can't keep it (financing) up forever."

ABORTION AS A PUBLIC HEALTH CONCERN

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 9, 1974

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, with the recent defeat of the Roncallo amendment, the House has concurred with the Supreme Court decision that abortions are to be left up to individual conscience. Along with many medical and legal controversies that have been presented by this issue, public health professional have been faced with complex problems regarding the effects of legalized abortion. Dr. Carl Tyler is an expert in public health aspects of abortion. He is chief of the Center for Family Planning, a board certified obstetrician-gynecologist, a fellow of the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, a member of the American Public Health

Association, and is employed by the Federal Center for Disease Control.

Dr. Tyler recently testified before the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments regarding Senate Joint Resolutions 119 and 130. At this time, I would like to enter into the RECORD his testimony which discusses trends in abortion mortality and diseases related to abortions, public health issues with regard to the increasing practice of abortion, and his personal views on the effect of making abortions illegal:

STATEMENT OF CARL W. TYLER, JR., M.D.,
F.A.C.O.G.

Although the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare takes no position on the resolutions which are the subject of this morning's hearing, the Center for Disease Control has collected information on the practice of legal abortion for almost five years. Recent revisions of state statutes on abortion began with Colorado in 1967. In 1969, ten states cooperated with the Department in the establishment of a voluntary system for the reporting of legal abortion. That year, more than 22,000 such abortions were reported to the Center for Disease Control. In 1970, 24 states reported more than 190,000 abortions to CDC, and in 1971, the number of abortions reported to CDC exceeded 485,000, even though the number of cooperating states increased to only 25. In 1972, the latest year for which we have complete data available, more than 586,000 legal abortions were reported to CDC. More detailed information on the practice of legal abortion in the United States is available in the Abortion Surveillance Report published by CDC. With the Committee's permission, I would like to enter the most recent issue of that report into the record.

The number of deaths attributed to abortions of all kinds has declined steadily since the middle of 1960, but this decline appears to be more marked in recent years. From the early 1950's through 1965, between 220 and 320 women died each year of causes that were related to abortion. By 1968, the most recent year for which official statistics are now available, 133 deaths were attributed to abortion. In an effort to obtain more current specific information on abortion mortality, the Center for Disease Control initiated a special inquiry of state and selected city health departments in 1972. Seventy-one deaths were reported to CDC for that year; this number is almost half that reported for 1968, and provisional data for the intervening 3 years did not show an appreciable decline. Reporting through this special system is not yet complete for the past year, but . . . current indications are that the number of deaths will be substantially fewer in 1973 than in 1972. Special reports from selected state and local health departments support these national findings.

Hospitalization of women with complications of abortion has also decreased in recent years. Data from the Hospital Discharge Survey for 1965, 1968 and 1971 show a steady decline in hospital discharges for women with diagnoses related to abortion and its complications. These national statistics are supplemented by information from the state of California and New York, and in studies from specific municipal hospitals in Los Angeles, San Francisco, and New York City. A report from Atlanta offers additional support for this contention because it documents a decline in the hospitalization of women who state they have had illegal abortions, the complications of which necessitated hospitalization.

Although most women hospitalized with complications of abortion have infection or bleeding problems, there is a great deal of concern among health professionals about

mental health problems associated with abortion. Four reviews of the mental health literature lead me to conclude that there is, at present, no substantial evidence that the performance of an abortion on a woman is any more likely to cause a new major mental health problem for her than is the delivery of a full term infant. Some women do have feelings of regret and/or guilt following an abortion, but there is no good evidence to suggest that these feelings are greater following an abortion than they are after a term pregnancy.

Current reports from state and local health departments shows that approximately two thirds of women undergoing abortion are unmarried. In some states (such as Kansas, Oregon and Washington), the proportion of unmarried women undergoing abortion was more nearly three out of every four. This finding correlates with more detailed reports from California and from New York City which indicate that out-of-wedlock births have declined. [The relatively sophisticated report from California shows that not only has there been a decrease in the number of illegitimate births for women of all age and racial groups, but there has been a similar decline in the illegitimate birth rates as well. The data from New York City is remarkable because the number of out-of-wedlock births decreased after 1970 for the first time in almost ten years. Health officials in New York City point out that this reversal in the trend of out-of-wedlock births was associated in time with the passage of New York State's abortion law, which took effect in 1970, but that no such change in trend had followed the earlier introduction of that city's vigorous public family planning program.]

Infant mortality is at an all time low for the nation, (and in New York City the infant death rate is lower now than it has been at any time in the past 20 years.) Health authorities for this city point out that the low level of infant mortality is attributable in large part to an improvement in the infant mortality rate for out-of-wedlock births. They link this improvement to the decline in the out-of-wedlock birth rate for their city and suggest that the infant mortality rate would be 40% higher than its current level had this decline not occurred. (Infant deaths, according to standard vital statistics definitions are deaths to infants born alive. Infant deaths are, therefore, distinct from fetal deaths, stillbirths and abortions.)

Many factors influence the health of women and their offspring, and among these are contraceptive services and programs of infant and maternity care, to mention just two. Although sufficient facts are not available to fully and conclusively document all of the public health effects of abortion, it seems reasonable to conclude that recent declines in abortion deaths and hospitalizations related to complications of abortion are the result of legal and judicial actions which relieved some of the restrictions on the practice of this operation.

The practice of legal abortion has created some public health problems. Between July 1970 and January 1973, for example, approximately 40% of women undergoing abortion left their home state to have this operation performed. As a result, follow-up care was difficult to provide, and incidents occurred in which the officials of one state became aware of an abortion-related death that was unknown to the health officials in the state where the abortion had been performed. Problems of jurisdictional authority and appropriate regulatory action occurred in at least one instance.

A second problem area involved the use of untested abortion methods in inappropriate circumstances. A report of this incident, which occurred in Philadelphia, was presented to the Senate Health Subcommittee last spring when it held hearings on protect-

ing human subjects participating in research. Even though these two problems arose in association with the legalization of induced abortion, the fact that abortion is legal permitted the problems to be identified in such a way that they can be controlled. Had the practice of abortion been illegal and clandestine, it is unlikely that effective control measures would be possible. And it should not be forgotten that abortion deaths have decreased on a nationwide basis as abortion laws have become less restrictive.

The question that remains to be answered is: Will enactment of the resolutions before this Committee have a favorable effect on the health of the American public? I personally believe—and I note here again that this is my opinion as an individual and not as an HEW representative—that they will not. These resolutions will certainly eliminate the legal practice of abortion. But even as powerful a legal force as a constitutional amendment will not end the practice of abortion itself. In 1955, the expert group at the Arden House Conference on Abortion estimated that there were no fewer than 200,000 abortions performed illegally each year in this country. Now, 19 years later, the number of American women in their reproductive years has increased by more than ten and a half million, and these women have an independence of attitude and action that could not have been anticipated in 1955. I believe that putting Joint Senate Resolutions 119 and 130 into effect will increase death and disease in women with unwanted pregnancies and will reverse any favorable effects which the practice of safe, legal abortion may be having on the health of the American people.

INFLATION SQUEEZES MORTGAGE MARKET IN PITTSBURGH—PART II

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 9, 1974

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the stress of rising inflation hits hard at every sector of American life. Foremost among our problems is the plight of potential home buyers who face a tight money market, high-interest rates, reluctant lending institutions, and little sign of relief.

In examining the mortgage money situation in the Pittsburgh area, Mr. Thomas P. Benic's recent two-part article in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette focusses upon the difficulty of harmonizing sound business and social practices. Mortgage money is the fuel propelling the entire real estate industry; and when it is tight, it is also the depressant retarding the realization of consumer needs and wants. The conflict is not an easy one to resolve. As Mr. Benic points out, it may be financially unwise to extend loans for home mortgages or refurbishments, when industrial or personal credit extensions are more advantageous, but housing is and will continue to be a salient national priority.

The problem is compounded for those citizens desiring money for purchase or renovation in older sections of the city. Many lending institutions will not touch property in declining neighborhoods, thus, speeding the very blighting conditions we strive to reverse. Older areas of our cities may not be redlined, but the

fear that the property will not endure the life of the loan discourages many lenders.

Financial experts agree that the mortgage interest rate is crippling the housing industry and will not drop until inflation is brought under control. As part of the effort to deal with this problem I wish to cite Mr. Benic and include his article for the RECORD.

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, July 23, 1974]

CITY'S BUILDING SWINGS TO MULTIPLES—SINGLE DWELLINGS ON WAY OUT

(By Thomas P. Benic)

For 20 years the Amore Construction Co. had been typical of the moderate size, financially strong, single-family home builder in the Pittsburgh housing market.

The firm built an average of more than 50 homes a year in the upper price bracket. This year it will build none.

"We started phasing out single-family construction three years ago and now we're 100 per cent out of it," said Bruce Schoenfelder, vice president. "Land and material costs have pushed the single-family home out of the reach of most but the most affluent. The affluent market has never been big here."

Amore is now building mostly medium-size townhouse apartment complexes of about 50 units with rents beginning at \$350 a month.

"A lot of people could afford more but they're not interested in a large single-family home," Schaefer said. "Most of our customers are over 45, and their children are grown. They want a luxury living style, but they don't want to worry out the upkeep on a property."

Statistics compiled by ACTION-Housing support Amore's contention.

Eight of every 10 housing units built in 1960 in the four-county area were single-family homes. Last year, the ratio was 6 of 10, and this year the estimate is that about 5 of every 10 will be single-family homes.

Single-family home construction has dropped 45 per cent since 1960, from 9,300 units to an estimated 5,100 units this year. Apartment construction has doubled in the same period, from 2,100 units to an estimated 4,400 units.

"The day of the single-family lot subdivision is ending," Schaefer said. "We're going to the European concept where you have to plan better to cope with less land and more expensive land. The idea now is to put the same number of people on a smaller plot, then dedicate the rest to public use. Instead of everyone having his own backyard, we'll all share a big yard."

Whether most suburban homeowners are ready to shuck their backyard barbecues, shopping centers and car pools for a more urban-type existence remains much in doubt. Apartment developers are still meeting stiff opposition beyond the city line.

Ryan Homes, which has nearly 20 per cent of the single-family market in this area, reports unit sales up 9 per cent during the first 6 months of this year compared to the first half of last year. A spokesman said he was reluctant to predict how sales would go the rest of the year, however.

Ryan's size and the fact that it has its own finance company makes it atypical of the average developer here.

Crawford Construction Co., still heavily committed to the single-family field, is perhaps a better example. The firm built more homes than ever last year—but had its worst profit ratio.

The single-family issue still is in doubt in the suburbs but the books are practically closed in the city. Only 63 single-family homes were built in the Pittsburgh city limits last year. Only 21 building permits for

single-family homes were issued the first six months of this year.

Apartment development, on the other hand, has a 10-year average of more than 1,000 units a year.

David O'Loughlin, the city's housing coordinator, sees no change in the pattern despite a \$5-million commitment of city funds to subsidize home ownership in the city.

The city's subsidy program, bolstered by \$2 million in state funds, is expected to enable 700 new housing starts in the Hill District, Manchester, Garfield and Homewood over the next several years. While it is encouraging, it hardly will satisfy the city's housing needs, he said.

The city hopes to see more than 1,000 apartment units started this year with the overwhelming percentage being unsubsidized, commercial ventures that will pay full taxes, O'Loughlin said.

"It's very encouraging what's happening this year, considering what's happening around the country," O'Loughlin said. Planned developments such as the 645-unit highrise complex at the Ross Township border could be the trend for the future, he said.

While apartments can be built as profit-making commercial ventures without government subsidy, all but the most expensive single-family homes to be built in the city will require financial aid to the builder, he said.

A house that costs a builder \$25,000 in material and labor might be worth only \$17,000 if it is situated in the Hill District, O'Loughlin said. The city will give direct subsidies up to \$10,000 per unit to bridge this gap.

"It's a very flexible program," O'Loughlin said. "I don't know of another city in the country that has it."

Charles Lieberth, area director for the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, said the reluctance of builders to come into deteriorated areas is to be expected—and the fact that it is in these areas that housing needs are most acute only complicates the problem.

"There has to be an incentive for private capital to get involved. Subsidy is an ugly word when it comes to housing," he said.

Then pointing out of his Northside office, which affords a view of Three Rivers Stadium and the Golden Triangle, he added: "Look out of this window and you can't see anything that has not been subsidized in some fashion."

OIL PROFITS KEEP RISING

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 9, 1974

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, though questions involving Presidential impeachment and resignation have dominated the news lately, I recently came across an item concerning energy which I would like to share with my colleagues. According to an article that appeared in the Washington Post, July 25, the profits of six major oil companies have continued to skyrocket.

What makes this information noteworthy is that virtually every economist, to some degree, has attributed our current problem of runaway inflation to increased oil prices. Furthermore, it should be pointed out that these record profits have been piled upon the incredible prof-

its already amassed by the oil companies during last winter's gasoline shortage.

As a result, I urge Congress to take this information as further evidence of the fact that we must now do everything in our power to establish a greater degree of control over the oil monopolies. Mr. Speaker, the article follows:

SIX OIL FIRMS RECORD SHARP PROFIT GAINS

Six major oil companies, including Mobil Oil Corp., the nation's third largest, yesterday reported sharply higher profits for their latest fiscal periods.

Mobil's data showed a 99 per cent boost in its second-quarter profits from 1973 and an 84 per cent increase in first-half profits.

But chairman Rawleigh Warner Jr. said first-half earnings from foreign petroleum operations increased by only 18 per cent if gains from inventory valuation and currency changes were excluded.

Figures for Occidental Petroleum Corp., the 10th largest oil producer, indicate gains of 292 per cent in second-quarter profits and 402 per cent in first-half profits.

Dr. Armand Hammer, Occidental's chairman, said the gains reflected unusually high demand, primarily for chemical products and coal, with agricultural chemicals and fertilizers most active.

Also reporting earnings were Continental Co., eighth largest; Phillips Petroleum Co., 11th largest; Ashland Oil, Inc., 15th largest; and Standard Oil Co. Ohio Corp., No. 18.

Mobil's second-quarter net income rose from \$184.2 million (\$1.81 a share) in 1973 to \$367.4 million (\$3.61); sales, from \$2.97 billion to \$5.11 billion.

First-half net income rose from \$340 million (\$3.34) to \$626 million (\$6.15); sales, from \$5.77 billion to \$9.53 billion.

Warner, Mobil's chairman, noted that expenditures for exploration and producing in the United States exceeded the firms U.S. earnings.

Continental's second-quarter net income increased from \$51.7 million (\$1.03) to \$100.45 million (\$1.99), a 94 per cent jump. Sales grew from \$1.03 billion to \$1.8 billion.

First-half net income rose by 111 per cent, from \$99.2 million (\$1.97) to \$209.6 million (\$4.15). Sales were \$3.4 billion compared with \$1.96 billion.

Continental said the value of its inventories increased due to a sharp rise in tax and royalty payments and the cost of purchasing host-government oil. Second-half earnings are not expected to include significant inventory profits.

Occidental's second-quarter net income was \$92.6 million (\$1.59) on sales of \$1.61 billion compared with 1973 second-quarter net income of \$23.6 million (36 cents) on sales of \$810.3 million.

First-half net income was \$160.4 million (\$2.74) on sales of \$2.94 billion compared with net income a year earlier of \$31.9 million (40 cents) on sales of \$1.49 billion.

Phillips Petroleum's gains were 166 per cent in the second quarter and 127 per cent in the first half. Net income in the quarter was \$123.8 million (\$1.63) on sales of \$1.32 billion compared with net income of \$46.4 million (61 cents) on sales of \$693.8 million. For the half, net income was \$204.7 million (\$2.70) on sales of \$2.47 billion compared with net income a year earlier of \$89.8 million (\$1.19) on sales of \$1.37 billion.

Six-month net income is listed after a charge of \$27.6 million for an accounting change involving a cumulative effect prior to Dec. 31, 1973.

Ashland reported net income for the third quarter ended June 30 of \$32 million (\$1.25), a 40 per cent gain over 1973 third-quarter net income of \$22.1 million (88 cents). Sales rose from \$517.6 million to \$917.8 million.

Nine-month net income rose from \$60.4 million (\$2.38) to \$85.7 million (\$3.40), a

41 per cent gain. Sales rose from \$1.44 billion to \$2.23 billion.

Ashland officials said profits grew in chemical, oil, gas, coal mining and road building operations.

Sohio second quarter net income rose by 18 per cent from \$42.3 million (\$1.15) to \$50.3 million (\$1.37); sales, from \$394.9 million to \$553.1 million.

First-half net income rose by 21 per cent from \$59.8 million (\$1.63) to \$72.9 million (\$1.99); sales, from \$774.6 million to \$1.04 billion.

The 1974 quarter includes a nonrecurring gain of \$12.8 million from a tax loss carry-forward; the 1973 quarter had a \$15.3 million nonrecurring gain from property sales.

THE IMPORTANCE OF H.R. 70 FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

HON. JOHN BRADEMAs

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 9, 1974

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, H.R. 69, a bill to extend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which is awaiting signature by the President, contains an important 1-year increase in Federal funding for programs to educate handicapped children.

We approved this 1-year increase, Mr. Speaker, because important legislation to benefit the handicapped is now pending before the Select Subcommittee on Education, which I have the privilege to chair.

I refer to H.R. 70, a bill to enable the Federal Government to pay up to 75 per cent of the excess costs involved in educating handicapped children—costs above the expenses required to educate nonhandicapped children.

On May 22, 1974, Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post editorially endorsed this legislation, calling it landmark legislation which is "necessary" and "very welcome."

Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my colleagues, I include the Washington Post editorial at this point in the RECORD:

SCHOOLS, COURTS, AND THE HANDICAPPED

Handicapped children have a right to public education, and throughout the country the courts are beginning to enforce that right. The most recent decision was in Maryland where, last month, Judge John E. Raine Jr. of Baltimore County ordered the state to provide education for severely handicapped children by September 1975. Like most states, Maryland does not provide for many of the children who suffer most grievously from retardation and physical disabilities. The costs of schooling these children runs high—perhaps five or six times as high as normal children—and it demands highly specialized teachers. These requirements make it a particularly appropriate target for federal aid.

The difficult and complex job of drafting landmark legislation is now under way in Congress, under the leadership of Harrison Williams (D-N.J.) and Jennings Randolph (D-W. Va.) in the Senate and John Brademas (D-Ind.) in the House. But as the probability of a presidential impeachment rises, the chance of enacting legislation on this scale in 1974 steadily falls. The bill is necessary, and it will be very welcome when it finally arrives. But the courts are pressing the states to begin meeting their responsibilities immediately.

Sen. Charles McC. Mathias (M-Md.) has now persuaded the Senate, correctly, to vote

for a stopgap provision to help these children until the larger bill can be passed. Some of the supporters of the Williams-Randolph-Brademas bill have evidently been inclined to resist the Mathias amendment, on grounds that a partial remedy may undercut a comprehensive one. But the Mathias amendment is explicitly only an interim measure authorizing \$630 million for one year, and it lacks the refinements that permanent legislation will require.

The Senate has now attached the Mathias amendment to the bill extending the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Since the House has already passed a similar bill, the issue of school aid for these children will be settled in the conference committee. Unfortunately the attention of the conference will be mainly turned to the various regrettable anti-busing amendments that have been hung onto the bill. However angry that debate becomes, it is crucial that the conferees keep clearly in mind the more urgent business before them. If Congress does not act promptly, the courts will press states harder and, in the absence of legislation, judges will be drawn into the process of designing and overseeing school programs for handicapped children. It is a job that Congress can do much better than the courts, but to do it Congress will have to move quickly.

PENSIONS FOR WORLD WAR I VETERANS

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 9, 1974

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, historically our Nation has recognized the debt we owe to our veterans. We recognize that our veterans have interrupted their careers, their education and nonmonetary benefits, for the service our Nation in a time of need. For the most part, we have tried to compensate these men, both in terms of monetary and nonmonetary benefits, for the service they have given to this country. This practice is in accordance with our belief that no veteran of this Nation should have to live in poverty or in need.

Yet, over one-half million of our veterans do live below the poverty level. If these veterans were young, strong bodied men and women we would most certainly feel concern for their plight. What then should we feel when we find out that these veterans are, on the average, almost 80 years of age? The men I refer to and the men we are concerned with here today are, of course, the veterans of World War I.

Three of the bills that this committee is now considering, H.R. 13977, H.R. 14552, and H.R. 14782, would provide a service pension for World War I veterans and their widows and dependents. From the time of the Revolutionary War until World War I, land grants, pensions, and other benefits were awarded to veterans. But, for some unknown reason, the World War I vet was largely forgotten. Many of these veterans and their families had to struggle for their entire lives to overcome the educational and vocational setbacks they suffered as a result of their service. Many others suffered extreme losses as the result of another disaster, the depression of the 1930's. Now, the World War I vet is nearing his twilight

years. There are only 1.1 million of them remaining. Many are living in poverty or are reduced, against their will, to taking welfare. Almost all realize that they have been treated unfairly.

Fortunately, this Nation regained its sense of conscience and veterans who returned from World War II were provided with unemployment compensation, educational opportunities, and hospital and rehabilitation benefits. But still, we made no effort to correct the inequity accorded to the World War I veteran even though 56 years have elapsed since the close of the war.

The history of the World War I vets battle to secure a pension and benefit plan equal to those granted to the veterans of other wars is not one we can be proud of. For a short time, under the disability allowance law which was passed around 1930, some vets drew up to \$12 to \$18 a month in pension benefits. These meager benefits ceased when, in 1933, the economy act was passed. It was not until close to 20 years later when the so-called "old law" was enacted that the World War I veteran was reinstated on the pension rolls. However, according to the 1963 veterans administration figures, 45 years after the close of the war, only 49 percent were drawing any monthly benefits and this included both compensation and pension beneficiaries, as contrasted with Civil War veterans who drew in 24 years, and Spanish-American War veterans who drew in less than 20 years. Furthermore, the World War I veteran received very few educational, business, farming, or housing benefits.

World War I veterans are not asking for a hand out but a hand up—benefits equal to those currently being received by the veterans of World War II, Korea, and Vietnam. Let me share with you some of these World War I veterans' letters. These letters express far better than you or I could, the need for the legislation we are considering today.

Maybe someday when there is only a very few of us old vets of World War I left they will do what they should have done long ago—

I do not see how they can carry the load any more without an increase in dues.

We need somebody to go to bat for us. When you get in the eighties you are not what you used to be.

I wish they would give us a pension with no strings attached to it but don't know if we will ever get it that way.

With the 20% increase in Social Security I now get less to live on. I carry a clip board around getting signatures on a petition in favor of the World War I service pension.

First World War Veterans should be taken care of just as much as other veterans.

We are all up in age and I personally think it would not hurt to give a flat rate of a decent amount instead of all the up and down business. We too gave to our country.

It is time to heed the voices of these men and women and enact a comprehensive pension plan for World War I veterans. It is time to redress the wrong that has been done to these veterans. Currently, the highest pension a World War I vet—nonservice connected—can receive is \$2,600. This figure can only be attained by the veteran if he is not receiving any other forms of outside income such as social security or railroad retirement. If the vet does not have an

outside source of income his pension decreases accordingly. To make this situation worse, most World War I vets were too old to build up social security maximums so that now they cannot even count on this as a sufficient means of income.

The bills we are considering today would not only equalize veteran benefits but they would also provide the World War I vet with pension benefits commensurate with the service they have given to their country. These bills will raise the pension benefits for single veterans and for veterans with dependents and also for the widows of veterans. Veterans or widows with dependents would receive around \$150 dollars a month. While this represents a cost increase over the present VA plans it is one which certainly can be justified. Furthermore, after the initial dollar outlay the cost of these new pensions would decrease because the administrative aspects of the program will have been consolidated and improved.

Last, I would also like to say a few short words on behalf of H.R. 2687. Since the last increase in pension benefits on January 1, 1974 the consumer price index has risen by 5.9 percent. It is next to impossible for persons living on a fixed income to keep pace with the controlled, and seemingly uncontrollable rate of inflation we are currently experiencing. I am proposing in H.R. 2687 that disability and death pension benefits be raised to a more realistic level. Many of our veterans are facing serious financial hardships—some are even receiving welfare benefits—and it is our responsibility to see that this situation is remedied.

The concern of the Congress over this legislation is evidenced by the large number of Members who have sponsored these pension bills. Much of the credit for the active support this legislation has received lies with the work that has been done by the Stars and Stripes National Tribune, a great newspaper which covers veterans' affairs. Ken and Alice Hubbs, the editors of the Stars and Stripes, have clearly demonstrated the effectiveness of this newspaper in helping to move legislation through Congress. For example, during the massive effort last summer to keep the Public Health Service hospitals open, the Stars and Stripes' publication of the voting record of the Members combined with their coupon clip campaign to allow individuals to request their Representatives to vote on the issue was a key item in winning the battle to keep the PHS hospitals open. I would like to insert for the Record samples of the coupons which were so effective:

Date:
Mail to:
Congressman:
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Please cast your vote to override the veto of S. 504.

Thank you.
Name:
Address: ZIP.
Veterans Organization:

Date:
Mail to:
Operation S. 504
Stars and Stripes,
P.O. Box 1803,
Washington, D.C.

Tally my letter to Congressman:

Please keep us informed on future veterans' legislation.

Comments:

Name:

Address: ZIP.

Veterans Organization:

The Stars and Stripes has launched a similar campaign in the present effort to pass World War I veterans' pension legislation. The following is an example of this:

WWI SERVICE PENSION BILLS

The following forms are for your convenience to clip and mail to your two U.S. Senators from your State and your Congressman from your District. Mail the bottom form to The Stars and Stripes for the reason stated thereon.

For additional copies of these forms, simply cut all four out and take to your local Instant Print firm who can reproduce them on a legal size sheet very economically.

Date _____

The Honorable _____,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C. 20510:

DEAR SIR: Would you please support the provisions of HR 13579, HR 14782 and S 3383 and advise the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of your support? Also, would you please sign Rep. Wright Patman's H. Res. 1217?

Thank you for your concern for the World War I veteran and his dependents.

Yours in Patriotism,

Name: _____

Street: _____

City: _____

State: _____

Zip: _____

Veterans' Organization Membership: _____

War served: _____

Date _____

The Honorable _____,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C. 20510:

DEAR SIR: Would you please support the provisions of HR 13579, HR 14782 and S 3383 and advise the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of your support? Also, would you please sign Rep. Wright Patman's H. Res. 1217?

Thank you for your concern for the World War I veteran and his dependents.

Yours in Patriotism,

Name: _____

Street: _____

City: _____

State: _____

Zip: _____

Veterans' Organization Membership: _____

War served: _____

Date _____

Operation "World War I Service Pension"

Mr. KENNETH R. HUBBS, Editor, the Stars & Stripes, P.O. Box 1803, Washington, D.C. 20013:

I mailed the above forms to my Senators _____ and _____ and to my Congressman.

Please tabulate this for the use of National Veterans' Organizations and The Combined National Veterans' Association. I will keep you posted on the number of people I recruit to write their Congressmen.

Yours in Patriotism,

Name: _____

Street: _____

City: _____

State: _____

Zip: _____

Veterans' Organization Membership: _____

War Served: _____

Comments: _____

The Stars and Stripes National Tribune—its editors and publishers is to be commended—for its effort to improve

life for our veterans. It is truly gratifying to me to see a newspaper which is so dedicated.

EFFORT TO UPGRADE CHILD HEALTH SERVICES NEEDED

HON. JAMES W. SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 9, 1974

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Speaker, on May 21, 1974, I made a floor statement regarding the urgent need for congressional leadership and fresh executive initiatives in an effort to upgrade child health services. At that time, I called to the attention of my colleagues an excellent critique of the existing child health care system.

Since then, I was pleased to note the American Broadcasting Co.—ABC-TV—presented a fine news closeup on this same subject. This television special raised a number of serious health care questions including:

At least 12 million children in the United States do not receive health care from year to year. Why?

Nearly half of all poor children in the United States have not been immunized against polio. Why?

The United States has one of the higher infant mortality rates in the industrialized world. Why?

Such life and death questions can be partially answered through the kind of programs examined in the latest Reader's Digest article by Lester Velle on the prospects for improved child care. The Velle article now follows:

NEEDED: QUALITY HEALTH CARE FOR ALL OUR CHILDREN

(By Lester Velle)

The health of millions of the nation's children will be tragically neglected unless we make provably successful medical programs available to them—now.

Millions of our children—perhaps as many as half of them—are trapped in a cruel paradox. Most of the child cripples and killers of the past—polio, diphtheria, measles, influenza-pneumonia—have been conquered. But not necessarily for the children of the poor, near-poor and even lower-middle-class. These families may lack the price of admission to a private doctor's office or live in medical wastelands in our inner cities and rural areas where few doctors can be found. Instead of the preventive "well care"—the immunizations, checkups and attention to minor ailments—that these children need, many get "crisis care" only, obtained chiefly in overcrowded, understaffed emergency rooms of public hospitals.

Almost a fourth of our pregnant mothers don't get the prenatal care that could significantly reduce premature births and other birthtime emergencies. And the mortality rate for children in their first year of life who are from poor or near-poor families is double what it is for those from the middle class. Later, children may die prematurely because they are denied the preventive care that would nip rheumatic fever, chronic infections or asthmatic attacks.

Does this mean we don't know how to provide the lower-income and rural child with quality health care? Not at all. Indeed, models abound. Two of the most successful involve local-federal partnerships in neighborhood health centers:

FOR INFANTS: M & I'S

When Social Security Act amendments in 1965 made federal matching funds available, local health departments, medical schools, hospitals and community groups set up demonstration Maternal and Infant Care Centers (M&I's) to serve low-income neighborhoods. Unlike the present medical system that waits for patients to knock on a doctor's door, the M&I's made all of the neighborhood's expectant mothers and infants their concern, reaching out to bring them in if necessary. The doctor's reach was extended, too, by use of pediatric nurses, medical social workers, nutritionists and family counselors. These medical teams offered comprehensive well care aimed at bringing sound babies into the world and keeping them that way through the first, hazardous year of life.

Florida's Dade County M&I, for example, funded cooperatively by the federal and state governments and the county health department, provides anyone eligible—for a family of four, the annual income can be no more than 6,300—with person-to-person concern along with the latest in medical technology. We met six-months-pregnant Mrs. Alma M when she came in for her regular monthly checkup. An obstetrician found her overweight and counseled a diet high in nutrition for the baby, low in calories for Alma. A nutritionist then explained the diet and told her how to cook it; for example, broiling instead of frying to reduce calories by half. If Alma had been a "high risk" mother—one suffering from venereal disease, diabetes or hypertension—faculty members of the Miami University Medical School were available as a back-up advisory team. After delivery, Alma's baby would get the same quality care from the M&I health team as that available to the well-to-do child.

The Miami M&I has achieved a remarkable turnaround. In 1965, infant mortality in the neighborhoods it serves was 96 per 1000 live births; since last July, that rate has dropped to 3.6 per 1000. Unfortunately, there are but 56 such M&I's scattered through 34 states—caring for only ten percent of the country's eligible mothers and infants.

FOR KIDS: CHILD-CARE CENTERS

Local-federal cooperation has also shown how children of the poor and near-poor can be cared for beyond infancy. At San Francisco's Mt. Zion Hospital, a comprehensive child-care project has aided some 3600 youngsters from birth to 18 years old, and their families as well. Here, too, emphasis is put on preventive care. Says project director Rosalind Novick, "We call up our families to remind them to bring in their children for checkups and immunizations."

For Anne Bryant, her husband and their seven children, the Mt. Zion program has been "family doctor, counselor, advocate and friend." Last year, for example, when the Bryants' six-year-old entered school, he was so disruptive that Mrs. Bryant was told he would have to be put in a class for problem children. She took the child to her project center, where doctors and psychologists found that he was of above-average intelligence but hyperactive. Mt. Zion social workers and the boy's teacher worked out a special comprehensive program, and he was soon doing well in a regular class.

Another system of preventive care, Child & Youth Health Centers (C&Y's) has, in the last six years, reduced by half the hospitalization of children in the program. Together with the use of paraprofessionals, this has lowered the taxpayer cost per child to about \$10 a month—less than the cost of membership in most prepaid group-health organizations.

But, as in the case of the Maternal and Infant Care Centers, the C&Y's provide token relief. There are only 59, scattered through 28 states and the District of Columbia, and they reach fewer than five percent of the eligible

children. In 1973, the Nixon Administration proposed that support for C&Y's (all M&I's and C&Y's cost the government some \$111 million this year) be shared by the states, as called for in the original legislation. Only the vigorous lobbying of the M&I and C&Y program directors and by the American Academy of Pediatrics won extension of the federal grants for the child health centers for another year. As of July, the states must match a lower federal quota. The doctors argued that good health is the right of every child and that the centers were a historic beginning toward achieving that right—with more desperately needed.

DOCTORS' COUNTEROFFENSIVE

Meanwhile, the doctors of one state have shown that the medical profession itself can mobilize against maternal and infant deaths. Five years ago, the Wisconsin Academy of Pediatrics and the state health department surveyed 35 hospitals and found that 15 of every 1000 infants born live there did not survive the first four weeks of life. Dr. Stanley N. Graven of the University of Wisconsin Medical School, who headed the survey team, there helped launch a low-cost statewide "newborn program" that reduced the newborn death rate to nine per 1000.

How? At first, the solution seemed simple. All you had to do, Dr. Graven felt, was set up several centrally located intensive baby-care units and organize a transportation system to get high-risk mothers and newborns there. But then Dr. Graven made two startling discoveries: Outlying hospitals did as well in saving high-risk babies as urban hospitals, where conflicting demands on the time of highly trained obstetrics and pediatrics specialists kept them away when needed most—so that interns and nurses had to cope with emergency-delivery problems. Dr. Graven also found that at least two thirds of such emergencies were due to inadequate prenatal care.

Dr. Graven organized a "flying circus" of pediatricians and obstetricians to barnstorm the state's hospitals, inculcating a team approach to the delivery and care of newborns. This meant training special pediatrics nurses, doctors' assistants and associates to undertake much of the normal-delivery care so that doctors could attend to high-risk cases when they occurred. This, in turn, meant educating doctors to relinquish some of their traditional chores to nurses and paraprofessionals.

Since only a handful of hospitals had the new machines that measure the fetal heart-beat, or the respirators and other equipment needed for intensive care of ill newborns, Dr. Graven negotiated with eight of them to develop themselves as regional centers for high-risk mothers and infants. Then a statewide ambulance service was organized that put pregnant mothers or ill newborns no more than two hours away from a center.

THE OKLAHOMA PLAN

The trouble is that even the most efficient use of medical resources can't deliver health care to mothers and children unless sufficient doctors are available to provide it. Consider Oklahoma, which ranks 41st among states in the ratio of doctors to population: 1 to 900. Worse, 66 percent of these doctors are concentrated in six of the state's 77 counties—leaving many communities with no doctors at all. Thus, no Oklahoma University football coach ever worked harder to recruit a speedy wide receiver than rural town elders worked last fall at a recruiting fair in Oklahoma City to lure young doctors to their towns—offering to stake them to fully equipped clinics, homes and guaranteed earnings. No offers were accepted at that time.

But relief is on the way. Under a new Rural Medical Education Loan and Scholarship Fund, Oklahoma offers to pay a resident of Oklahoma attending any medical school in the country up to \$5000 yearly tuition and living costs in return for a minimum of two

years' service in an assigned rural area after graduation. So far, 27 students have received such loans. Last spring the first beneficiary of this program completed his internship, and now the town of Warner has its first doctor in 15 years.

Meanwhile, Sen. Abraham Ribicoff (D., Conn.) has proposed a national "Community Physicians Service Program" that would provide medical students with the complete cost of their education, plus the cost of setting up an office—in return for three years' service in areas with few physicians. Ribicoff estimates that this \$150-million-a-year program could channel some 7000 to 10,000 doctors to shortage areas.

WHO WILL PAY

Overshadowing all problems connected with providing health care to children is the problem of cost.

For example, Dr. Graven recalls a \$28,000 hospital bill presented to the Wisconsin parents of twins who were maintained in an intensive-care respirator. All but \$1800 had been covered by insurance. But for a young couple, \$1800 on top of doctors' costs is a financial disaster. And how shall we provide the children of the poor and near-poor with continuing, preventive well care as well as sick care?

Virtually all authorities believe that some form of national health insurance is necessary. But unless we expand medical services to absorb any new medical purchasing power we provide by legislation, we will have more medical-cost inflation. For instance: since Medicare increased medical purchasing power without increasing the supply of medical resources, it helped quadruple hospital costs and triple doctor costs. And since private doctors continue to be scarce in low-income areas, many Medicaid card holders have been unable to purchase care, turning to hospital emergency rooms instead.

Clearly, a new national strategy is needed. One approach, favored by former Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare Wilbur J. Cohen, who was a principal architect of the Social Security Act of 1935 as well as Medicare and Medicaid, is a "junior Medicare." This would not only pay medical bills for all children under six but help make additional health care available with loans from a new insurance fund to community groups, doctors, hospitals and medical schools to set up additional neighborhood health centers. These would then bill junior Medicare for services to children just as doctors and hospitals now bill Medicare for services to the aged. Such billings would also help repay the start-up loans.

Another approach, favored as a minimum measure by the American Academy of Pediatrics, is national health insurance for children under six, requiring employers to buy Blue Cross, Blue Shield and commercial health insurance for the children of their employees. Such coverage for children could be coupled with federal action to expand the present neighborhood health centers and so meet the special needs of poor and near-poor children.

As Congress ponders the various health reform bills now before it, we should all remember that children don't vote and don't lobby. The health needs of almost half our children will continue to be neglected unless we speak up for them.

THOMAS JEFFERSON'S PLEA FOR UNITY: WISDOM FOR TODAY

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 9, 1974

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, following the divisive election of 1800, Thomas Jefferson

delivered an eloquent inaugural plea for unity which deserves thoughtful consideration today, by each Member of the Congress and by each American citizen.

While the times in which we live have sharpened our differences, we should realize that every difference of opinion is not a difference of principle. As Jefferson put it:

We have called by different names brethren of the same principle. We are all Republicans; we are all Federalists.

Today, during these crucial days, let us remember that we are all Republicans, we are all Democrats; indeed, we are all Americans.

How do we know this? Because the peoples' vision of good government is unanimous. Jefferson said:

A wise and frugal government, which shall restrain men from injuring one another, shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned. This is the sum of good government; and this is necessary to close the circle of our felicities.

I can only hope that each of us will keep that Jeffersonian ideal close before our eye in the weeks and months ahead.

THOMAS JEFFERSON: PLEA FOR UNITY

During the contest of opinion through which we have passed, the animation of discussions and of exertions has sometimes worn an aspect which might impose on strangers unused to think freely, and to speak and to write what they think; but this being now decided by the voice of the nation, announced according to the rules of the Constitution, all will of course arrange themselves under the will of the law, and unite in common efforts for the common good.

All too will bear in mind this sacred principle, that though the will of the majority is in all cases to prevail, that will, to be rightful, must be reasonable; that the minority possess their equal rights, which equal laws must protect, and to violate which would be oppression.

Let us then, fellow-citizens, unite with one heart and one mind, let us restore to social intercourse that harmony and affection without which liberty and even life itself are but dreary things. And let us reflect, that having banished from our land that religious intolerance under which mankind so long bled and suffered, we have yet gained little, if we countenance a political intolerance, as despotic, as wicked, and as capable of as bitter and bloody persecutions.

During the throes and convulsions of the ancient world, during the agonizing spasms of infuriated man, seeking through blood and slaughter his long-lost liberty, it was not wonderful that the agitation of the billows should reach even this distant and peaceful shore; that this should be more felt and feared by some, and less by others, and should divide opinions as to measures of safety; but every difference of opinion is not a difference of principle. We have called by different names brethren of the same principle. We are all Republicans; we are all Federalists.

If there be any among us who wish to dissolve this Union, or to change its republican form, let them stand undisturbed as monuments of the safety with which error of opinion may be tolerated, where reason is left free to combat it.

I know, indeed, that some honest men fear that a republican government cannot be strong; that this government is not strong enough. But would the honest patriot, in the full tide of successful experiment, abandon a government which has so far kept us free and firm, on the theoretic and visionary fear, that this government, the world's best hope,

may, by possibility, want energy to preserve itself? I trust not. I believe this, on the contrary, the strongest government on earth. I believe it the only one where every man, at the call of the law, would fly to the standard of the law, and would meet invasions of the public order as his own personal concern.

Sometimes it is said that man cannot be trusted with the government of himself. Can he then be trusted with the government of others? Or, have we found angels in the form of kings to govern him? Let history answer this question.

Let us then, with courage and confidence, pursue our own federal and republican principles; our attachment to union and representative government. Kindly separated by nature and a wide ocean from the exterminating havoc of one quarter of the globe; too high-minded to endure the degradation of the others, possessing a chosen country, with room enough for our descendants to the thousandth and thousandth generation, entertaining a due sense of our equal right to the use of our own faculties, to the acquisition of our own industry, to honor and confidence from our fellow-citizens, resulting not from birth, but from our actions and their sense of them, enlightened by a benign religion, professed in deed and practised in various forms, yet all of them inculcating honesty, truth, temperance, gratitude, and the love of man, acknowledging and adoring an overruling Providence, which, by all its dispensations, proves that it delights in the happiness of man here, and his greater happiness hereafter; with all these blessings, what more is necessary to make us a happy and prosperous people?

Still one thing more, fellow-citizens, a wise and frugal government, which shall restrain men from injuring one another, shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned. This is the sum of good government; and this is necessary to close the circle of our felicities.

MORTGAGE MARKET SQUEEZED BY INFLATION IN PITTSBURGH—PART I

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 9, 1974

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the stress of rising inflation hits hard at every sector of American life. Foremost among our problems is the plight of potential home buyers who face a tight money market, high interest rates, reluctant lending institutions, and little sign of relief.

In examining the mortgage money situation in the Pittsburgh area, Mr. Thomas P. Benic's recent two-part article in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette focuses upon the difficulty of harmonizing sound business and social practices. Mortgage money is the fuel propelling the entire real estate industry; and when it is tight, it is also the depressant retarding the realization of consumer needs and wants. The conflict is not an easy one to resolve. As Mr. Benic points out, it may be financially unwise to extend loans for home mortgages or refurbishments, when industrial or personal credit extensions are more advantageous, but

housing is and will continue to be a salient national priority.

The problem is compounded for those citizens desiring money for purchase or renovation in older sections of the city. Many lending institutions will not touch property in declining neighborhoods, thus, speeding the very blighting conditions we strive to reverse. Older areas of our cities may not be redlined, but the fear that the property will not endure the life of the loan discourages many lenders.

Financial experts agree that the mortgage interest rate is crippling the housing industry and will not drop until inflation is brought under control. As part of the effort to deal with this problem, I wish to cite Mr. Benic and include his article for the RECORD:

MORTGAGE MONEY TIGHTENS IN AREA

(By Thomas P. Benic)

The 24-year-old salesman approached his bank about a mortgage for a three-story stone front home on the central Northside.

The double-brick home was as sound as his excellent credit rating. The price was \$10,000. He earns \$12,000 a year and has \$13,000 in a savings account at a major Pittsburgh bank.

"They turned him down flat," said Charles J. Lieberth, area director for the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). "I called the bank and they said they'd reconsider. They asked if he would accept a 50 per cent down payment a five-year mortgage. I couldn't believe it."

The young salesman's plight is characteristic, though extreme, of what thousands of potential home buyers face today in the four-county Pittsburgh housing market, Lieberth said.

Mortgage money is expensive and sometimes difficult to get even for homes in the suburbs and better residential sections of the city, he said. For inner-city dwellings, the mortgage money supply has just about dried up.

Unless the financial experts are wrong, the situation won't improve much during the next year and the depressed market for new homes here will continue to decline, he added.

"Until either the interest rate goes down or stabilizes, things won't change much," said Robert E. Johnston, executive director of the Builders Association of Metropolitan Pittsburgh. People are stunned by the sharp rise in inflation and interest rates, he added.

New housing starts dropped 11 per cent last year and are expected to plunge another 8 per cent this year in Allegheny, Beaver, Washington and Westmoreland counties, according to ACTION-Housing statistics.

The causes of this downward spiral are apparent.

Mortgage interest rates, which average around 7 per cent two years ago, are expected to stay around the current 9 per cent level at least through the end of the year, financial experts say.

The phenomenal increase in the cost of new homes—from an average in the four-county area of \$25,500 in 1972 to an estimated \$35,500 this year—is expected to continue to rise, builders say.

The buyer of a new home today can expect to pay 25-year mortgage payments of \$300 a month for that average-priced home compared to \$180 a month it cost for the average home under prevailing interest rates in 1972.

A spokesman for Equibank's mortgage department said quite frankly that the bank refuses to finance home mortgages in questionable city neighborhoods.

Equibank also shies away from any small mortgage, regardless of the borrower.

A spokesman for Pittsburgh National Bank agreed to discuss the bank's mortgage policy, then several hours later a public relations offi-

cial called to cancel the interview. "The mortgage people say they just don't want to be quoted on the policy," the official said.

Officials at Mellon Bank and Union National Bank report that minimum mortgage amounts are not required. Both limit their mortgage business chiefly to their own customers, however. Mellon requires a 20 per cent down payment while Union requires 25 per cent.

While banks have the money they are not required and, in fact, would be financially foolish to use a great deal of it on home mortgages. Industrial, commercial and even short-term personal loans are much more lucrative.

Savings and loan associations, savings banks and mortgage companies finance the majority of home mortgages. These lending institutions, however, are finding money harder to get and more expensive.

"We're in an extremely tight money situation," said Roy Stoehr, senior vice president at First Federal Savings and Loan, the city's largest. "We're forced to borrow money for a short term at 11½ per cent interest and lend it out at 9½ per cent on long-term mortgages."

Savings and loans have to borrow now because the individual saver is much more sophisticated today, Stoehr said. Instead of putting his money in a savings and loan where it will earn 5½ per cent, the saver will invest in corporate notes that pay several percentage points more.

The problem is even more severe for small financial institutions such as Dwelling House Savings and Loan in the Hill District. Last year Dwelling House financed more than \$1 million worth of mortgages for customers who were predominantly black and marginal financial risks. This year's mortgage outlay will not approach that figure.

For mortgage companies, which have no funds of their own but act as agents for large stock companies, the pressure to write mortgages for the best of customers is probably most intense.

"If you have a good home in a declining neighborhood, the company that buys our mortgages won't touch it," Thomas E. LoDolce, assistant vice president for Advance Mortgage Corp., said. "They don't red line areas but underwriting policies prohibit acceptance of these mortgages. They just won't take the risk."

If the buyer can get the mortgage insured by the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) or the Veterans Administration (VA), the secondary mortgage market will of course accept it, LoDolce said. But for obvious financial reasons most sellers of homes would rather go the conventional mortgage route.

The FHA interest ceiling on insured mortgages now is 9 per cent; while the secondary market is buying mortgages for about 9½ per cent, LoDolce said. This means that the buyer of the house gets a break on the interest rate but the seller would be assessed points to make up part of this interest subsidy.

For every ¼ of 1 per cent difference between the FHA ceiling and the actual mortgage rate, the seller is assessed one point (1 per cent of the selling price of the house). In this case the seller would have to pay four points or 4 per cent of the selling price. That amounts to \$1,200 on a \$30,000 house.

Only 4 per cent of all homes sold here last year had FHA insured mortgages compared to 20 per cent in 1969.

Financial experts agree that the mortgage interest rate, which appears to be crippling the housing industry here, will not drop significantly until inflation is brought under control.

There are plenty of suggestions on how to tackle inflation but none has worked for the Nixon administration so far.

PUBLIC OPINION AND THE ENVIRONMENT

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 9, 1974

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I have frequently made note of the need to continue our efforts to improve the quality of our environment. During the recent attempts to roll back the clock on environmental protection laws, I tried to convey my sense of the will of the people as well as fight for what actions were necessary to protect the public health and welfare.

It is because of these efforts that I was pleased to see a recent memorandum from the President's Council on Environmental Quality that confirmed that public opinion still supports strong, environmental controls. It is not unusual these days to learn that the public is more sensible than the politicians who are supposed to represent them. I believe that this is the case with environmental legislation.

I would like to insert this memorandum into the RECORD at this time to allow others an opportunity to read it.

The memorandum follows:

PUBLIC OPINION AND THE ENVIRONMENT

In response to recent inquiries, the CEQ staff has compiled the latest available information on public opinion and the environment. While not every one of the surveys and polls reported on below can be considered individually representative of nationwide trends, together they give a reasonably thorough summary of environmental opinion in most regions of the country. The overall impression is that environmental issues remain very important in the minds of the public, especially as state and local issues. The energy crisis and aftermath appears to have affected this relatively little. The summary of results given below is organized into a series of topics for presentation purposes.

1. Issues of environmental quality continue to be of paramount importance:

In a poll by Congressman Mallory (Vermont) in March of this year, 80 percent of respondents believed that environmental issues demanded urgent attention.

A statewide poll in Florida prepared by Cambridge Research Survey and released in April of this year showed that 59 percent considered environmental issues the state's most important problem, up from 10 percent in 1970.

2. Many people feel strongly that insufficient progress is being made in environmental efforts:

In the Florida survey mentioned above, 30 percent believed that environmental quality had not improved over the past five years, while 40 percent believed it had actually declined.

A December 1973 nation-wide survey by EPA showed that there are more people who believe that the environment is getting worse than that it is getting better.

One question in a recent poll of Alabama citizens gave respondents a choice among three characterizations of the current state of the environment. 42 percent believed that "it is time to sacrifice everything to finding solutions" to environmental problems; 57 percent believed the situation was "serious but resolvable with only minimal changes to lifestyle and the economy." Only .009 percent felt the environment was "a fad and there is no reason for concern."

3. There is general citizen support for

spending more money to improve the environment:

A poll by Congressman Beister (Pa., suburban) shows that 69 percent favor more to be spent on environmental cleanup.

Another poll by Congressman Mezvinsky of Iowa found 61 percent in favor of increased spending and 28 percent more favoring the current level of spending; only 11 percent favored a reduction.

4. There is considerable evidence that citizens are willing to support the added cost of environmental cleanup through higher prices and taxes:

The EPA study found, among other things, that a) a majority of car owners would pay increases of \$150 for anti-pollution devices on new cars; b) homeowners are willing to bear an average increase of 22 percent in their monthly electric bills to pay for pollution abatement at powerplants; and c) people will pay on the average of 15 percent more in solid waste handling costs to have it recycled.

A poll by Congressman Conlan (Ariz. urban) found 59 percent willing to pay more for products that would do less damage to the environment.

In a poll last August, Congressman Taylor of North Carolina found 72 percent willing to pay higher taxes to support environmental protection. This high level of support comes from a constituency that can by no means be characterized as heavily pro-environment; on another question in the same poll, 88 percent favored construction of the Alaska pipeline.

5. Beyond support for environmental programs and willingness to pay, many citizens believe that activism on environmental issues is important:

The EPA study found that 28 percent of those surveyed had personally engaged in some activity which they felt had improved the environment.

Two questions on the Alabama poll asked what would be the most effective role for environmental organizations at the state and local levels respectively. In both cases, working directly with public officials on the enactment and execution of environmental legislation and decisions ranked highest, ahead of education, information gathering, community projects, providing speakers and forums, and numerous other activities.

6. This increasing desire for activism by citizens on environmental issues is borne out by the latest figures from nationally recognized environmental organizations:

1974 income for the National Wildlife Federation (600,000 members) is at an all-time high.

The Audubon Society experienced the greatest growth in membership in history during the energy crisis of last winter and spring.

7. Considerable progress continues to be made at the local level to create new environmental institutions and new ways to bring environmental factors into decision-making. A recent survey by the International City Manager's Association showed:

30 percent of cities and 35 percent of counties responding require environmental impact statements on at least some classes of projects.

40 percent of cities and 48 percent of counties have a senior official with primary responsibility for environmental affairs.

25 percent of cities have enacted an environmental component for their master plans, and 33 percent more have it under consideration.

8. Public support for environmental improvement has weathered the energy crisis well; few see any connection between the environment and the cause of energy shortages, and few support measures to relax pollution regulations.

A national Gallup poll in January 1974 asked who was responsible for the energy crisis. The results:

[In percent]

Oil companies	25
Federal Government	23
Nixon administration/Nixon	19
U.S. consumers	16
Arabs	7
Big business	6
Leaders playing politics	4
U.S. exporting too much	3
There is no shortage	6
Ecologists	2

(Multiple answers.)

A poll conducted by Congressman Beister (Pa., suburban) in June 1974 found 80% believing that only limited changes in the Clean Air Act are necessary to attain energy self-sufficiency.

A poll early this year by Congressman Ford of Detroit (one of the areas hardest hit by the energy crisis) reported that while 34 percent thought pollution standards should be lowered "while the energy crisis lasts," the other two-thirds wanted them retained at present levels or strengthened.

9. Land use and growth issues are becoming increasingly important to the public, and assumptions about the inherent value of growth and change are being discarded in even the more conservative regions:

In the International City Managers Association poll, land use and urban growth were considered to be the most pressing environmental problems by city officials.

A poll of Minneapolis-St. Paul residents in January, 1974, found 68 percent believing that urban sprawl exists as a problem in the Twin Cities area, and fully 50 percent of the opinion that all new construction should be limited to already developed areas.

In the Florida poll, 72 percent statewide supported strong land use controls to prevent uncontrolled growth. 80 percent of east coast and Dade County (Miami) residents believed there should be severe limits on further development. Two-thirds of respondents statewide were willing to use the state eminent domain power to protect environmentally endangered lands.

In Idaho, a poll by the State Water Resources Board found 64% in favor of state control of flood plain development; only 10 percent opposed. On another question, 40 percent believed that the state water plan should promote growth 30 percent believed it should promote growth, and 20 percent felt it should be neutral. 10 percent had no opinion.

In Delaware a coordinated attempt by the DuPont Company, the State Chamber of Commerce, the AFL-CIO, a consortium of oil companies, and many small developers to repeal the State Coastal Zone Law failed when strong citizen action convinced the sponsors in both houses of the Legislature to withdraw their repeal bills.

10. Recent election results show the continuing power of environmental issues at the polls:

In the 16th California Congressional District, the Democratic nomination in the June 1974 primary was won by the candidate with the support of environmental groups. His opponent attributed his loss to this endorsement.

In recent California elections, three propositions of environmental importance were on the ballot. All won. They included a \$250 million bond issue for park acquisition; another \$250 million bond issue for sewage treatment facilities; and the authority to divert up to 25% of state gas tax revenues to mass transit. The latter proposition carried in 1974 after losing in 1972.

The Florida poll mentioned above asked respondents to indicate their likelihood of voting for candidates proposing a number of stands on environmental issues. The highest negative voter reaction was to proposals 1) to relax regulations to allow more land development and 2) to cut back the funding of state environmental protection agencies.

RUTHERFORD WOMAN WRITES COLUMN FOR CHURCH PAPER

HON. ED JONES

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 9, 1974

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the opportunity today, to honor Miss Marilyn Boyett, of Rutherford, Tenn. Miss Boyett was stricken with polio at the age of 9, and is confined to an iron lung for 23 hours per day.

In August 1973, Marilyn began writing a regular feature article for the Cumberland Presbyterian Missionary Messenger. The column, called, "Looking Up With Marilyn Boyett," is printed in the Messenger monthly.

I have known this young woman all of her life, and know her to be a person of great faith, intelligence, and spiritual strength.

Through her faith and love of God, Marilyn has been able to share her thoughts with her many readers. I read her column monthly and am always encouraged and heartened through her willingness to serve the church in such a gracious and meaningful way.

Marilyn's anniversary article appeared in the Dyer, Tenn., Tri-City Reporter on August 1. The text of that article follows:

[From the Tri-City Reporter (Dyer, Tenn.)
Aug. 1, 1974]

RUTHERFORD WOMAN WRITES COLUMN FOR CHURCH PAPER

Marilyn Boyett, 35, a Rutherford woman who was stricken with polio in August, 1948, at the age of 9 years, is writing a regular feature article for the Cumberland Presbyterian Missionary Messenger monthly.

Miss Boyett, who is confined for 23 hours a day in an iron lung, tells in her first anniversary article, published in August 1974, the problems faced by a columnist in getting material together for an inspirational column.

Miss Boyett's column has brought her praise from all over this country and many people in foreign lands.

This week, with her permission, The Tri-City Reporter is privileged to print her anniversary column titled "Looking Up With Marilyn Boyett":

Hello:

This month marks the first anniversary of Looking Up. The enjoyment of sharing my thoughts with the church has grown. I had not written before and naturally I encountered some qualms about expressing my feelings.

When the editor asked me to write a column each month I wondered where the material would come from and just how many subjects I could find to talk about. They have come to me in strange ways. I remind myself of a minister who is always searching intently for new material. I once spent the entire day trying to think of something worth writing about—finally marking off the day as wasted. Early the next morning I received an inspiration through the mail. By that afternoon the column was written.

Let me share the process "Looking Up" goes through before reaching the press. First, I'm always listening, reading and meditating. I then try to compose these in my mind. This is usually done in the very early morning or during some of my "quiet hours." When my attendant-secretary, Birdie Horner,

comes on duty, I dictate my thoughts to her word by word. We then compose a rough draft, later going back and making some simple corrections or rephrasing some thoughts. I depend on her to give me her honest constructive criticisms. Without her, there could be no column for the Messenger. She patiently attends my every need. Sometimes, it takes a while for me to get my thoughts expressed. She has been with me for more than eight years. By now we have grown to love and respect each other very much.

When I said that I would write the column, I had to consider whether Birdie was willing to help me. She doesn't come over on any regular schedule, but only when she is called. So I sometimes keep my mental thoughts "stored" away until she can come and write them on paper for me. It would be much easier if I could just write them down whenever I wanted, but God does not intend it this way.

After getting the material in the form I want, it is ready for typing. Our minister, James E. Hunter (with the help of others) does this for me. He was instrumental in bringing the Messenger editor and me together last year. I certainly had no idea that a monthly feature would be the result. Each article has to be in the Messenger office two months prior to publication. So, you readers might drop by my house and find me writing about spring or summer during a heavy snow.

Few realize the time and work that is involved in getting one of my articles to press. Without God giving me strength and wisdom, plus these other willing people, I would not be able to share my experiences with you. Many of you have written me during the year. This has been God's way of letting me know it is His will that I should witness this way. Often I have marvelled at the way important people witness to their faith in public crusades. I have wondered at times whether I would ever reach anyone outside the circle of my personal friends. "Looking Up" is my way. Thanks be to God for this first anniversary of writing. Bye for now.

MARILYN BOYETT.

MILITARY AIRLIFT—A NATION- SAVING DEVICE

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 9, 1974

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of our colleagues an article in the July issue of Reader's Digest that illustrates why the Government must do everything in its power to fairly and equitably distribute its air transportation business between the U.S. scheduled and supplemental air carriers.

As we will all recall, during the period October 13–November 14, 1973, it became necessary for the U.S. Government to airlift massive amounts of materials to assist the Israelis and thus maintain the tenuous balance in the Middle East. We were able to immediately respond to Israel's needs, Mr. Speaker, because of the abilities of our Air Force's Military Airlift Command to divert the necessary aircraft to nation-saving missions at a moment's notice.

But, Mr. Speaker, the story really goes a little deeper, the Military Airlift Command has this ability because of the backup support it has been able to negotiate with the U.S. air carrier industry. Some 14 years ago, as a result of hear-

ings held by a subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, the Air Force entered into an arrangement whereby it would distribute the Department of Defense's air transportation business to both the large U.S. scheduled air carriers and the small U.S. supplemental carriers—on a proportionate basis—at fair and equitable rates, including proper profit factors—10½ percent—as set by the Civil Aeronautics Board. In return for this Government business, each of the air carriers agreed to give the Government first priority on the use of the carrier's aircraft in time of real need.

Mr. Speaker, obviously the administration should fully support the U.S. commercial air carrier industry. In awarding the Government business, the administration should fully comply with the declared policy of Congress as set forth in the Federal Property and Administrative Service Act of 1949. Congress, when it established this act, clearly intended that small business concerns receive a fair proportion of the Government's business. Yet, we currently have a situation whereby essentially none of the civil agencies or U.S. Postal Service air transportation business is placed with small business concerns—the U.S. supplemental air carriers.

During the Israeli airlift, the Military Airlift Command called upon the following 11 air carriers to provide augmentation airlift. It is noteworthy that half of these air carriers qualify as small business concerns:

Saturn Air Way, Inc., United Air Lines, Inc., Trans International Airlines, Flying Tiger Line, Inc., World Airway, Inc., Trans World Airlines, Inc., Seaboard World Airlines, Inc., Northwest Airlines, Inc., Pan American Airline, Inc., Eastern Airline, Inc., and Airlift International, Inc.

The Reader's Digest article follows:

THE AIRLIFT THAT SAVED ISRAEL

(By Charles J. V. Murphy)

The sun was setting on a fine fall day. In their home at McGuire Air Force Base near Trenton, N.J., Col. and Mrs. Donald Strobaugh were looking to the last-minute details of a party they were about to give. Then the phone rang. It was Strobaugh's commander. "Don, you're leaving on a mission right away," he said. "Pack your things and report to the command post."

"Where am I going?" Colonel Strobaugh asked.

Colonel Strobaugh, a 26-year-veteran, had a good idea where he was going. The date was Friday, October 12, 1973, and the Arab-Israeli war had been raging for six days. For the previous two days, the base, home of the 21st Air Force MAC (Military Airlift Command), had been bracing for a possible airlift to aid Israel. Within half an hour, Strobaugh was kissing his wife good-bye. He would not be back for 34 days.

Those 34 days would see an epic feat of supply by air—a demonstration of American aircraft and military planning that would give a new historical perspective to the term "airlift." MAC's great cargo jets would literally pump the iron lifeblood of survival into Israel, enabling that beleaguered nation to pass through a dark dawn of heavy losses and to launch a furious offensive in the Yom Kipur war.

Precipitating this drama was a gross misjudgment by the Israeli high command of the military resources needed to turn back an Arab assault. From October 6 to 9, Arab

armies fighting on two fronts destroyed or damaged 650 tanks, one third of Israel's armor. These ruinous losses were due largely to handguided Soviet missiles lavishly supplied to the Arabs. In a desperate effort to restore the balance on the ground, U.S.-built Israeli jets swooped down on the Egyptian and Syrian armies, only to be met by an eruption of radar-controlled gunfire and Soviet-built surface-to-air missiles—SAM 6s and 7s—that swiftly destroyed or damaged about 100 of Israel's 500 fighter-bombers.

With Israeli forces starting at the bottom of the barrel, Premier Golda Meir flashed a message to U.S. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, asking for immediate help. Her appeal had already been foreshadowed by U.S. intelligence sources, which had detected a gigantic round-the-clock Soviet airlift of munitions and military supplies to the Arabs—a steady stream of four-engine turbo-props coming down through Eastern Europe, refueling at Budapest or Prague, then flying on to Cairo or Damascus.

Neither President Nixon nor his advisers were disposed to rearm Israel for an annihilating counter-blow that might upset the tenuous "balance" in the Middle East. But, at a hastily summoned meeting of the U.S. National Security Council on October 10, a decision was made to send Israel whatever munitions were needed to prevent defeat.

Immediately, the Pentagon began rounding up materiel from military depots across the country: tanks, guns, shells, helicopters, radar equipment, body armor, fuel tanks, air-to-air and surface-to-surface missiles, even whole tail sections for fighter planes that had landed safely after Soviet-built, heat-seeking missiles had exploded near their tailpipes. By truck caravans, this war gear was rushed to nearby air bases where MAC's huge air freighters, brought in from their world routes, picked up the loads and relayed them to McGuire and Dover Air Force Base in Delaware, dispatch points for the 6400-mile flight to Tel Aviv. The pace of the lift, dubbed "Operation Nickel Grass," would be determined by how fast Colonel Strobaugh could handle the turnarounds at Tel Aviv.

FLYING THROUGH GIBRALTAR

On Saturday evening, October 13, the C-5 jet carrying the colonel and his special group of 55 communications and maintenance men lifted off from McGuire for the 13-hour flight to Lod International Airport in Tel Aviv, with a refueling stop at Lajes in the Azores. They touched down at Tel Aviv a few minutes after 1 a.m. Monday. Volunteer crews, many of them Israeli teen-agers and Americans from nearby kibbutzim, swarmed around the aircraft to help unload the tons of communications equipment and ammunition. In half an hour the cargo floor was bare.

Meanwhile, Strobaugh had been given an office in the engineering building of El Al, Israel's national airline. Seats from the first-class compartments of El Al's 747s, which had already been converted to cargo duty, were set up in a large conference room so U.S. flight crews could rest while their planes were unloaded. Soon the group had its communications gear operating, and the emergency channels from Lod to Lajes to Scott Air Force Base (MAC headquarters near St. Louis, Mo.) pulsed with coded messages; identification of planes en route; scheduled arrival times; nature of cargoes; weather; the number of rested relay crews available at Lajes.

The pace of the lift built rapidly. Even before Strobaugh had landed at Lod, 17 fully loaded American cargo jets were airborne from McGuire. They had to be directed over a zigzag route dictated not by efficiency but by diplomacy. America's NATO allies, fearful of exacerbating relations with Arab nations, had denied their air space to the airlift. This, the giant C-5s and C-141s, flying six miles above the earth, were required to navigate

directly "through" the Straits of Gibraltar into the Mediterranean, lest they pass over Spanish or British territory. Ten destroyers of the U.S. Sixth Fleet were stationed at intervals from Gibraltar eastward for possible use in search and rescue operations as well as to protect sea lanes. Near Crete, three aircraft carriers were ready to give protection in case Arab fighters rose to dispute their course.

FOOD AND FLOWERS

Back at the Pentagon, the logistics section of the Joint Chiefs of Staff determined the equipment to be released to Israel and organized its flow to the air bases on which MAC's planes were converging. Some 2400 miles east of McGuire, Lajes, mid-station for the airlift, was quickly transformed from a seldom-used fueling station into a major international staging area. Thirteen hundred men were rushed in: SAC aerial refueling crews to "feed" the F-4 Phantoms that were flying non-stop from Delaware to Israel; air controllers and computer specialists to plan arrivals and departures of heavily laden jets; air-police units to guard against sabotage; cooks to feed the equivalent of a small town suddenly transplanted to a sleepy Atlantic isle.

By dawn on the first full day at Lod, nine C-141s had landed and unloaded 300 tons of military hardware. Then the mammoth C-5s—capacity: 100 tons each—started to arrive. Israeli fighters flew protective cover as the giants touched down their 28-wheel landing gear.

By Tuesday, October 16, the airlift had moved to a high, steady beat. More than 900 tons of equipment had been unloaded during the first 48 hours, and most of it was already in the hands of fighting men on the Golan Heights, 100 miles to the north, or in the Sinai, 200 miles south. Strobaugh's headquarters at El Al was all crackling radios, chattering teleprinters, and the talk of flight crews gathering around a heaping buffet of fresh sandwiches, kept refreshed by the merchants of Tel Aviv. El Al stewardesses served coffee, and gave the airmen fresh fruits and flowers as they started back to the United States.

SWEATING DOWN

At first, the airlift cargoes had to be unloaded mostly by hand and a few light forklifts. Then the C-5s brought in three immensely powerful "K" loading vehicles—wheeled platforms which can be hydraulically raised to the exact level of the cargo-jet door, then loaded and lowered to the level of the trucks awaiting transfer of heavy items. With three such machines, Strobaugh was able to unload as much as 1000 tons a day.

MAC kept Strobaugh informed of arrival times so he could advise the Israeli Armored Command to schedule drivers to drive away the tanks, and technicians to reassemble the helicopters. As each plane drew into its unloading berth, Israeli army and air force logistics officers leaped into the cargo section and advised the Defense Ministry, over their walkie-talkies, of what was aboard. In minutes, the Ministry would decide where the different items were to go.

So smooth did the operation become that turnaround time at Lod—unloading, briefing the crew, preparing the plane for takeoff—was sweated down to under two hours for C-5s, 55 minutes for the smaller C-141s. Even more impressive was the time in which the war gear was sped to the front: three hours after unloading to reach the Golan Heights, ten hours to the Sinai.

Soon the miracle of the airlift had become routine. Every day, hundreds of tons of materiel, first lifted barely 24 hours earlier in the American hinterlands, were pushed out from Lod to the battlefronts: M48 and M60 tanks to replace heavy losses of armor as the Israelis drove across the Golan Heights toward Damascus; air-to-ground missiles

with which Israeli fighter-bombers obliterated tanks in the Sinai with an astounding 95-percent accuracy; air-to-air missiles that accounted for most of the 400 Arab aircraft that Israeli fighters knocked from the sky. The Israeli high command, its battle stocks replenished, took the upper hand in combat, and on October 22 the Arabs were forced to agree to a cease-fire.

WHAT A LIFT

Without question, Operation Nickel Grass was the most important single factor in turning the battle and preserving Israel's very existence. From start to finish, it was a masterly performance. Although the U.S. airlift started five days after the Soviet operation, by the end of the second week it had delivered more tons than its Russian counterpart. As the days went by, MAC steadily lengthened its lead. Altogether, the Russians delivered 15,000 tons of equipment to Egypt and Syria on 934 flights. MAC delivered 22,400 tons on 566 flights—over a route four times as long.

If decorations were awarded to airplanes, the C-5 would certainly have earned a Distinguished Flying Cross. All the harsh things that were said about the plane in 1969, when Senate critics tried to halt its production on cost grounds, became unworthy nitpickings in the light of its performance. In 145 flights the C-5s lifted some 10,800 tons. But it was what they lifted that made their performance spectacular: 50-ton tanks, 30-ton self-propelled cannons, 25-ton howitzers, plus helicopters, whole fuselages, and enough shells in a single lift to supply an artillery battery for a week. No other plane in the world could have done it.

In the middle of the night on November 14, the job done, Colonel Strobaugh and his staff left Israel as unceremoniously as they had arrived. On that last day, they took a quick bus tour of Jerusalem, Bethlehem and the Dead Sea—the first they had seen of Israel outside of Lod airport. Back at MAC headquarters, the Air Force pinned a Legion of Merit on Strobaugh for "exceptionally meritorious performance."

A few weeks later, as Israel settled back into a shaky truce, Premier Gold Mier spoke in deep emotion: "For generations to come, all will be told of the miracle of the immense planes from the United States bringing in the material that meant life for our people."

THE ORDER OF VEXILLOLOGY

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 9, 1974

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Pittsburgh Order of Vexillology is alive and well, under the leadership of Executive Director Martin O'Malley, a constituent of mine. Young Marty is a dedicated student of flags, coats of arms, symbols, and a good many other things.

While compiling a brilliant high school academic record, Marty has pursued his interests in flags and 2 years ago won a local "You Are the Flag Contest."

I would like to include in the RECORD at this time an article from the Pittsburgh Press concerning Marty O'Malley for the information of my colleagues and vexillologists everywhere:

AT 16, HE FLIES TOP FLAG

(By Harry Black)

Who designed the original 13-star flag of the United States?

If you said Betsy Ross, you're in the right field, but chances are you're wrong.

Betsy sewed the original U.S. flag, but she is among 13 contenders who vexillologists are studying to discover the designer, according to Martin O'Malley.

EXECUTIVE AT 16

Here's another question which 16-year-old O'Malley, the first executive director of the newly-established Pittsburgh Order of Vexillology, could answer without hesitation:

What is the color and number of stars in the Rhode Island Regimental Flag?

Thirteen and yellow. But, as O'Malley is quick to point out in his 241 Augusta St., Mount Washington, combination home-office, there has been some controversy over whether the stars are white or yellow.

Since he won the "You Are The Flag" contest two years ago, the St. Mary of the Mount sophomore has studied flags and worked to form the local Order of Vexillology (the study of flags, coats of arms, seals and symbols).

As chief founder, young O'Malley named himself executive director and oversees a board of directors including assistant director Carl Francolino, a Baldwin High School sophomore; treasurer Lawrence Korchnak, a St. Mary of the Mount teacher, and bookkeeper Gladys G. O'Malley, the executive director's mother.

He pasted the flags on loose leaf sheets and in six hours wrote a brief history of each flag. Leafing through this personal notebook, you might find:

"In 1847, when Liberia was declared an independent republic, the Liberian flag was raised for the first time. In 1822, the country was founded to serve as a home for freed slaves.

"The 11 stripes signify the 11 signers of the Liberian declaration of independence. The blue canton represents Africa and the single white star symbolizes the only Negro republic at that time . . ."

MEMBERSHIP BENEFITS

O'Malley will soon send out petitions of membership to county Veterans of Foreign Wars posts, American Legions and ethnic organizations. Anyone interested in vexillology is invited to join. Dues are \$10 a year.

The order will distribute its own quarterly periodical and offer access to the Flag Archives and Flag Bulletin which describe the specifics of all flags.

Although most of the meetings will take place at O'Malley's home, the executive director hopes an annual meeting will be held at one of the downtown hotels.

The man who coined the word "vexillology" is Dr. Whitney Smith of Winchester, Mass. He according to O'Malley, is the "world's only full-time vexillologist." O'Malley hopes to be the second.

He is working on his own book which will be published through the local order.

And one day he hopes to have the largest personal library anywhere on flag history. No easy task, he realizes, pointing out that "Dr. Smith has the largest single collection . . . over 4,000 books.

PRESIDENT NIXON

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 9, 1974

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, the past week has been historic and trying for the people and the Government of the United States. At few times in the past have the Constitution and the institu-

tions of Government been tested to the extent we have observed in these climactic days of the Watergate ordeal.

There are those who feel relieved that the burden of impeachment is removed from the shoulders of Congress. There are others who feel President Nixon should have stuck it out, and the Nation should have seen this matter carried out to the fullest extent under the Constitution.

Mail and other communications from my constituents left me with the clear impression that hundreds of them felt that impeachment was never necessarily a foregone conclusion, and with the impression that there was widely varied opinion on what constituted grounds for impeachment and ultimate removal of a President from office.

I am inserting in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, two views of the week's events, first as reported by the Sunday Ledger-Enquirer in Columbus, Ga., following an interview last weekend, and second is a statement I issued in the aftermath of the dramatic events which quickly unfolded as this historic week drew to a close.

The articles follow:

[From the Sunday Ledger-Enquirer, Aug. 4, 1974]

BRINKLEY WANTS SOLID PROOF

(By Constance Johnson)

U.S. Rep. Jack Brinkley said Saturday that hearsay and circumstantial evidence alone will not be sufficient for him to vote to impeach President Nixon.

It will take solid proof, he said, of something specific, such as paying hush money to Watergate burglar E. Howard Hunt, or using the IRS or FBI "to convict people, whether they were guilty or not."

Although the 3rd District congressman said it would be "premature" to make a decision in advance of hearing the evidence, his approach seemed close to that of James St. Clair, President Nixon's defense attorney in the impeachment proceedings.

St. Clair has argued that the case for impeachment boils down to whether or not the President directed a \$75,000 payment to Hunt for his silence. He also has maintained that there is no evidence anyone in the White House has succeeded in misusing the IRS or FBI.

Brinkley said in an interview Saturday that he holds to the principle of law that an accused person is innocent until proven guilty and that he accords the President that presumption.

"I'm waiting until all the facts are in," he said. The burden of proof is clearly on the House Judiciary Committee, he said. "They will have to show me."

Brinkley said that he has received transcripts of all the House Judiciary Committee's proceedings, is familiar with the White House tapes of conversations relating to Watergate, and watched portions of the committee's televised debates.

However, he said that the matter will be "brand new" when it comes before the full House, which, in effect, will serve as a grand jury to hear the evidence and vote yes or no on the Articles of Impeachment that have been adopted by the Judiciary Committee.

If a majority of House members votes to impeach—as is now predicted—the matter goes to trial before the Senate where it will take a two-thirds vote to convict the President or remove him from office.

"My judgment of what the Judiciary Committee did is not relevant to my vote," said Brinkley.

He also said he wouldn't be surprised if the new tapes, which the United States

Supreme Court ordered the President to turn over to Watergate prosecutor Leon Jaworski, "bring forth new evidence and a more complete story."

There are some House members, said Brinkley, "who smell blood and would convict on a scintilla of evidence, based on circumstantial evidence and hearsay. I pledge that I never will."

A move by some Republicans to try to substitute a vote of censure of the President for a vote on impeachment would not solve the issue, said Brinkley.

"I don't agree with that approach. I'm willing to bite the bullet and vote yes or no. The President is entitled to exoneration, or the people to removal of the President, as determined by the facts."

Brinkley, an attorney, said he views impeachment as a political rather than a criminal proceeding, because there is no criminal penalty involved.

However, he indicated that he believes that "high crimes and misdemeanors" must be of equal severity as the "treason" and "bribery" charges that the Constitution provides as the basis for impeachment.

It is "very wrong" for a President to use the IRS or FBI "in a lawful manner which might have the concurrent effect of harassment," said Brinkley. "But it is not impeachable."

What would be an impeachable offense, he said, was for someone in authority to "subvert these agencies, to tell them to make an audit, or a check, and regardless of the facts make a case. That involves moral turpitude and is impeachable," he said.

Another impeachable offense, he said, would be "paying hush money to Hunt, obstructing justice."

If the evidence sustains the Articles of Impeachment, Brinkley said he would have no problem making up his mind, and that he is anxious to get over the next four "agonizing" weeks.

"I believe it is of the utmost importance to move with dispatch. It is in the best interests of the country to decide yes or no with no middle ground."

Brinkley, a Democrat who generally has supported the President, said that he still has confidence in Nixon "in the area of foreign affairs. I have confidence in the belief that he wishes that which is good for the country, although I believe the economic and domestic fronts have suffered from a lack of a consistent policy from the Administration."

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN JACK BRINKLEY

As a member of Congress who called on the President in May to release all of the Watergate tapes, I am personally dismayed that the ordeal has ended this way. A President who will get high marks in history for his foreign policy achievements could have avoided the crisis that finally sees him leaving office under very negative circumstances.

Those who watched and heard the President tonight should remember other moments as well—such as when he literally risked his life by going on a peace mission to the Middle East when he was suffering from phlebitis.

As a member of the House who might have had to vote on impeachment, I was determined to keep an open mind. I don't think I will ever regret that position.

I was a strong advocate of Gerald Ford's confirmation as vice president, and I know from my personal friendship with him and our relationship in the House of Representatives that he will perform capably as President. For the sake of the nation, I fervently hope the Watergate ordeal is coming to a close, and that it will have had a cleansing effect on the conscience of America and a strengthening effect on her institutions of government.

GILMAN PROPOSES PROPERTY TAX RELIEF

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 9, 1974

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation providing for a system of property tax relief for low- and middle-income homeowners who are suffering under the onerous burden of the regressive property tax.

My property tax reform bill establishes an Office of Property Tax Relief and Reform within the Department of the Treasury to assist the States with a cost-sharing program of tax reform and relief. Using Federal incentives, the bill encourages the States to adopt some form of property tax relief, offering either cash payments, tax credits or refunds to homeowners and renters when property taxes exceed a certain percentage of an individual's income. The following table is proposed as a basis for adoption by the States:

If an individual's income is up to but not exceeding:	He would receive relief for those taxes paid in excess of:
\$3,000 -----	3% of that income
\$7,000 -----	4% of that income
\$10,000 -----	5% of that income
\$15,000 -----	6% of that income

For renters, tax relief would be computed at between 15 and 30 percent of their rentals, depending on local variations. Limitation on all relief is set at \$500.

The bill also includes some worthy proposals for improved administration, informational services and implementation of property tax relief, all designed for fuller disclosure and understanding of the most regressive of our taxes, the property tax.

Many argue that property taxation is a matter of local concern. While I agree with that contention, the urgent need for decreasing the burden of property taxes mandates Federal involvement. This measure has as few Federal strings as possible.

Since property taxation is the major support for financing our schools, the need for reform becomes increasingly more evident—in 1965 nearly 80 percent of local school bond issues were approved, in 1971 only 41 percent passed.

This falling off of local support for improving our educational systems is not reflective of our Nation's lack of interest in quality education, but is rather a reaction to the financial burden of increasingly rising property taxes coupled with the rapid rise in the cost of living. If our schools are to survive and thrive, it is evident that: First, we must find an alternative to the property tax as a basis for school financing and second, the Federal Government must increase its role in financial education costs. Presently, local revenues finance 52 percent of our education costs, the State absorbs 41 percent with the Federal Government contributing only 7 percent.

Since a pie can only be divided into just so many slices, those revenues lost

from property tax relief will have to be picked up somewhere else along the line. Accordingly, with the administration of property tax relief, such as I have proposed, additional revenues will have to be garnered. However, it is my firm opinion that once we rid ourselves of the burdens of property taxation, the most regressive and despised tax of all, we will be able to look toward a more equitable means for funding our schools, possibly through the imposition of a plan for increased income tax.

The course ahead is fraught with many challenges. The first step is property tax relief, the second step will involve a careful study of alternative equitable taxation so that our Nation can continue to move forward toward its goal of superior and equal education for all of our young people.

AMERICA AND FRIENDS SPEAK OUT IN 15TH ANNIVERSARY OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 9, 1974

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the most salutary aspects of the 15th anniversary of Captive Nations Week, which was observed last month both here and abroad, was the strident and eloquent manner in which officials and citizens spoke out in behalf of all the captive nations and peoples in Central Europe, within the Soviet Union, in Asia and in Cuba. Anyone guided by politico-moral principles and their basic importance in international as well as domestic relations could not do otherwise. Not only this, but the speak-out in all sections of our country as well as abroad in itself provides a wholesome contradiction to the strange Russian-bred myth accepted by some—that of “noninterference in the internal affairs” of totalitarian states. Where political barbarism prevails, injustices are rampant, national and personal exploitation is widespread, and fundamental freedoms and human rights are blatantly negated, for a civilized humanity there is no justification for this alleged principle.

Among the numerous examples of the success of the week, as collected by the National Captive Nations Committee and which have already appeared in these pages over the past few weeks, I wish to include the following exemplary items for the reading benefit of our Members and the general citizenry: A proclamation by Governor Jack Williams of Arizona; an excellent rendition over the Manion Forum by Mr. J. Fred Schlafly on “Our Last Best Hope for International Peace”; and a communication by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America to Secretary of State Kissinger regarding Ukrainian political prisoners:

PROCLAMATION—CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Whereas, millions of people on this earth are living in a state of oppression in nations held captive by stronger and ruthless communist powers; and

Whereas, there is an ever-present concern for the well-being of such peoples who are deprived of the human right of self-determination; and

Whereas, peoples of captive nations are of special concern to the United States of America, the last, strong bastion of freedom on earth; and

Now, therefore, I, Jack Williams, Governor of the State of Arizona, do hereby proclaim the week of July 21 through July 27, 1974, as Captive Nations Week and do call upon all citizens to reaffirm their moral support of the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations now under the domination of Communist powers.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused to be affixed the great seal of the State of Arizona.

Done at the Capitol in Phoenix this 16th day of July in the year of Our Lord One Thousand Nine Hundred and Seventy-Four and of the Independence of the United States the One Hundred and Ninety-ninth.

[From Manion Forum, July 14, 1974]

OUR LAST BEST HOPE FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE—THE 1959 CONGRESSIONAL MANDATE FOR THE FREEDOM OF THE CAPTIVE NATIONS (By Mr. J. Fred Schlafly)

DEAN MANION. John Fred Schlafly, the distinguished and busy Illinois attorney whom you have heard frequently on this program, has recently become President of the World Anti-Communist League. Our delusive and destructive detente to the contrary notwithstanding, the World Anti-Communist League carries the only dependable formula for national and international peace in this troubled, modern world. I will leave it to Mr. Schlafly to give you the reasons for that along with some description of the aims and purposes of this great association of some of the world's most distinguished and influential people. Mr. Schlafly is here with me at the microphone now.

My friend, welcome back to the Manion Forum.

Mr. SCHLAFLY. Thank you, Dean Manion. The World Anti-Communist League has chapters in the principal nations of the world, such as Japan, Australia, and the other non-Communist Far East nations, Great Britain, France, West Germany, and the other NATO countries, Canada, the United States, Mexico, Brazil and other Latin American countries.

A purpose of the World Anti-Communist League is to expose and oppose the Communist system of slave labor and denial of freedom to emigrate. The work of the Anti-Communist League has been confirmed by two courageous Russians, writer Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn and scientist Andrei Sakharov. They have revealed that Soviet slave labor and punishment without a trial did not begin and end with dictator Stalin. They began with Lenin in 1918 and are an essential part of the present Soviet system bossed by Brezhnev.

Scientist Sakharov called on President Nixon and Leonid Brezhnev to proclaim freedom at their Moscow Summit: freedom of religion, freedom to emigrate, and freedom for political prisoners. Unfortunately, statements issued by the Nixon-Brezhnev Summit Conference did not mention freedom or liberty. Worse, when NBC, CBS, and ABC newsmen attempted to broadcast their interviews with Sakharov, the Kremlin censors cut them off the air. Since Brezhnev will not permit freedom of speech even to members of President Nixon's party in Russia, talk of detente and cooperation is a big fraud.

But the month of July supplies the great liberty and freedom declarations which Nixon and Brezhnev failed to make. First in time and importance is our Declaration of

Independence adopted on July 4, 1776. President Nixon might have read its words to the Russians in his broadcast:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness. That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. That whenever any form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government."

Not as well known, but also very important, is the Captive Nations Resolution. This great document of human liberty was passed by the United States Congress and approved by President Eisenhower on July 17, 1959.

The Captive Nations Resolution proclaims these timely truths about which Mr. Brezhnev and Mr. Nixon were so silent in Moscow:

"The enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by Communist imperialism makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful co-existence between nations and constitutes a detriment to the natural bonds of understanding between the people of the United States and other peoples."

"Since 1918 the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Russian communism have resulted in the creation of a vast empire which poses a dire threat of the security of the United States and of all the free peoples of the world."

"The imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Viet Nam, and others."

"These submerged nations look to the United States, as the citadel of human freedom, for leadership in bringing about their liberation and independence and in restoring to them the enjoyment of their Christian, Jewish, Moslem, Buddhist, or other religious freedoms, and of their individual liberties."

"It is vital to the national security of the United States that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the peoples of these conquered nations should be steadfastly kept alive."

"The desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of the people of these submerged nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to war and one of the best hopes for a just and lasting peace."

"It is fitting that we clearly manifest to such peoples through an appropriate and official means the historic fact that the people of the United States share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence."

"The President of the United States is authorized and required to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July 1959 as 'Captive Nations Week' and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities. The President is further authorized and requested to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world."

Fifteen years ago, in the summer of 1959, Vice President Nixon arrived in Moscow shortly after the Captive Nations Resolution was passed by Congress and signed by President Eisenhower. The same Congress had also passed large appropriations to build up the strategic forces of the United States with B-52 bombers capable of attacking all parts of the Soviet Union; and for the development of Minuteman intercontinental bal-

listic missiles, also capable of striking all parts of the Soviet Union.

RESOLUTION GETS PRIORITY

Dictator Khrushchev did not object to the development of American weapons capable of destroying the Soviet Union, but he violently objected to passage of the Captive Nations Resolution. He charged up to Vice President Nixon at the American home exhibit in Moscow and, in the celebrated kitchen debate, voiced strenuous objections to the Captive Nations Resolution. Khrushchev was a frank fellow and was probably removed from office by his peers in 1964 because he talked too much. To paraphrase Shakespeare, he did protest too much, we think.

In this kitchen debate, Khrushchev revealed that the great weakness of the Soviet Union is not in military weapons on land, sea or air, but in the Captive Nations which constitute its slave empire. The recent death of Marshal Zhukov, Russia's highest ranking general, disclosed that he was fired because the Communists do not trust their own military leaders. Still less do they trust the 200 million people inside the Soviet Union who make up the Captive Nations. These people constitute our best hope for peace and freedom.

Since freedom and independence have not been achieved for any of the 22 Captive Nations listed in this Resolution, nor for nations subsequently overcome by Communism, such as Cuba, Laos, and North Cambodia, our President and all our citizens are directed by this Captive Nations Law to continue to work for the freedom of the Captive Nations all over the world.

If these 25 Captive Nations were free, there would be no need to levy on the people of the Free World huge taxes for the purpose of opposing Communist aggression. If these Captive Nations were free, Communism as a threat would disappear because its slave empire, extending from the Elbe River in the middle of Europe to the Pacific Ocean, would be replaced by these free nations friendly to the West.

If the Captive Nations were free, the slave labor camps in Russia and China, some of which are so eloquently described by Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn in "The Gulag Archipelago", would vanish, and the millions of wretched slaves would once again be free men.

If the Captive Nations were free, everyone's standard of living would be better because of the elimination of heavy taxes for armaments and for foreign aid to Free World countries threatened by Communism.

If the Captive Nations were free, citizens could leave any country which denies human liberty and migrate to countries which safeguard human liberty. This competition from those voting with their feet would deter countries from denying freedom to their citizens.

We protect the United States and prevent future wars of Communist aggression by proclaiming the Captive Nations Resolution and participating in observances of Captive Nations Week.

We must assure the Captive Nations that they are not forgotten, and that we are on their side and not the side of their jailers. We will thereby win priceless allies for ourselves inside the Iron, Bamboo and Sugar-Cane Curtains who, in the event of a cold or hot war, will constitute an army of freedom fighters.

GREATNESS STEMS FROM LIBERTY

The greatness of the United States does not lie in our farms and factories and transportation systems, wonderful as they are. Our greatness is that from the Declaration of Independence in 1776 to the Captive Nations Declaration in 1959 the United States has stood for liberty to work, worship and travel as each citizen desires. Our Statue

of Liberty in New York Harbor has been an invitation to the oppressed people of the world to come to the United States and live in freedom.

In none of the wars we have fought during the last 100 years has the United States sought or obtained any territorial gain or the reparations customarily demanded by the victor. Billions of tax dollars are appropriated each year by Congress to try and buy friends and allies, most of whom refused to help when the Communists attacked us in South Korea and in South Viet Nam.

Might it not be better if Congress reminded the world in general, and our President and Secretary of State in particular, that the Declaration of Independence and the Captive Nations Declaration still represent the policy of the United States? Any action by the Executive Department, such as lending taxpayers' money to Communist Russia or Red China to buy our wheat at bargain prices, to buy our latest model computers, and to build huge truck factories, giant fertilizer plants, and large chemical industries, merely strengthens the enemies of freedom and is contrary to our Declaration of Independence and to our Captive Nations Resolution.

A favorite cliché of the anti-anti-Communists is that the Soviet and Chinese Communist leaders have mellowed with age, that the Cold War is over, and that we have moved from confrontation to negotiation. Unfortunately, the facts are just the opposite. On August 20, 1968, just 17 days after he signed a nonaggression pact with Czechoslovakia, Leonid Brezhnev ordered the invasion of Czechoslovakia by 650,000 troops supported by late-model tanks and planes.

Recently, he has placed around the American Embassy in Moscow armed guards who forcibly prevent American citizens from entering the Embassy. One of those so harassed before she was finally allowed to obtain her American passport was the 67-year-old widowed mother of Simas Kudirka—the Lithuanian sailor who was kidnapped by the Soviets in 1970 directly off the deck of the U.S. Coast Guard ship Vigilant, where he had sought asylum.

Another American citizen blocked by Soviet guards from approaching the American Embassy in Moscow was Dean Hoxsey, an ex-Marine who fought on Okinawa during World War II, and who was roughed up on May 15, 1974, by Soviet police who keep the U.S. Embassy in a state of virtual siege. How can we say we have moved from confrontation to cooperation when the American Embassy in Moscow is surrounded by Soviet secret police who block the entry of American citizens?

The Communists lack spiritual weapons. Every Communist is required to be an atheist. No one will work and die for a system which teaches that death is the end of everything, that there is no life hereafter, no God, no Heaven, and no reward for a good life. So bleak is their future that many Russians seek relief in vodka and drunkenness.

In the Declaration of Independence and the Captive Nations Resolution we have two of the greatest spiritual weapons, of all history. Material weapons are not enough to preserve a nation. Rome fell when its legions became convinced that there was no justice in Rome and nothing in the Roman system worth fighting for.

Let us proclaim to the Government world our belief that all men are created equal in the sight of God and are entitled to their God-given rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Let us read the roll call of the 25 Captive Nations and show our deep and continuing concern that they obtain individual liberty and religious freedom.

Because the prophets of Communism, Marx, Lenin, Mao Tse-tung, and Leonid Brezhnev never talk about human liberty,

freedom of religion, or freedom to emigrate, there is no reason for us to do likewise. Let us use our best weapons for the hearts and minds of men. Let us win real allies and deter war by again and again quoting the great truths of our Declaration of Independence and our Captive Nations Resolution to the one billion human beings locked inside the Captive Nations. For far too long, we have neglected our best defenses against Communism, our arsenal of spiritual weapons.

DEAN MANION. Thank you, Fred Schlafly, President of the World Anti-Communist League, for reminding us that we are still pledged by the unanimous vote of both Houses of Congress to work for the freedom and national independence of the nations now held captive by Red China and Soviet Russia. I hope that the people who heard you here today will make haste to remind the President of that continuing resolution.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE
OF AMERICA, INC.,
New York, N.Y., July 31, 1974.

HON. HENRY A. KISSINGER,
Secretary of State, Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On June 22, 1974 during the National Manifestation in Defense of Human Rights in Ukraine, held in our Nation's capital and attended by 10,000 people from several states, a delegation of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America submitted to the White House a memorandum urging President Nixon to intervene with the Soviet leaders whom he was scheduled to meet in Moscow, on behalf of two Ukrainian political prisoners. These two prisoners are reportedly being tortured and drugged to their almost certain death. We also sent a telegram to President Nixon in care of the U.S. Embassy in Moscow during his stay in the Soviet capital for the same purpose. Regrettably, to this very day we have not received even a formal and routine acknowledgment of the receipt of our communications.

The two Ukrainian political prisoners in question are Valentyn Moroz, a 38-year-old Ukrainian historian who was sentenced to 14 years imprisonment and is currently incarcerated in Vladimir Prison in the Russian

Republic. He has been beaten and stabbed on a number of occasions by criminal inmates, with the full knowledge, if not instigation, of the prison authorities.

The other Ukrainian political prisoner is Leonid Plyushch, a 34-year-old mathematician and cybernetics specialist, who has been committed to a "psychiatric ward" in the Dnipropetrovsk prison in Ukraine for an indefinite period.

Both Moroz and Plyushch are being pressured to "atone" and recant their critical views of the Soviet system, which they steadfastly refuse to do.

In February, 1974, Prof. Andrei D. Sakharov, outstanding Russian physicist, sent an appeal from Moscow, urging international action to save Plyushch, whom he described as being "near death" as a result of large doses of haloperidol which have been regularly administered to him. Also, in June Prof. Sakharov sent two separate appeals to President Nixon and Secretary General Leonid Brezhnev, on behalf of Moroz, and on behalf of 98 Russian, Ukrainian, Baltic and Jewish political prisoners. Finally, Prof. Sakharov made another telephone appeal in the middle of July, 1974 stating that Mr. Moroz has been on and off a hunger strike since July 1, 1974, and his whereabouts as well as the state of his health are unknown, as prison authorities refuse to accept calls from abroad or release any information on the Ukrainian historian.

Mr. Secretary:

The Ukrainian American community and Ukrainians throughout the world, as well as many prominent intellectuals from various countries have been deeply concerned about the fate of V. Moroz and L. Plyushch. In Canada, a number of parliamentarians took the issue to the Canadian government. Last week Prime Minister Trudeau of Canada summoned the Soviet Ambassador in Ottawa and expressed the concern of his government and appealed to the Soviet government to release V. Moroz. There have been hunger protests and strikes by the Ukrainian youth and women's organizations in Ottawa.

Here, in the United States, hunger strikes and protests in defense of Moroz were held by Ukrainian women on July 23-26, 1974 opposite the U.N. headquarters, and by youth

and student groups in New York at the Soviet Mission to the U.N. in New York, and at the Soviet Embassy in Washington, D.C.

Also, protests and demands for the release of V. Moroz and L. Plyushch have been pouring in from various American labor, academic and professional groups; at least three U.S. Senators are known to have made demarches on behalf of V. Moroz: J. Glenn Beall, Jr., and Charles McC. Mathias of Maryland and Charles Percy of Illinois, and several U.S. Congressmen.

Mr. Secretary:

We are fully aware of the delicate status of U.S.-Soviet relations and our plea is not meant to upset it. On the contrary, it is in the context of improving U.S.-Soviet relations that we seek your support and intervention on behalf of Valentyn Moroz and Leonid Plyushch. Both President Nixon and you were successful in prevailing upon the Soviet government to relax its rules regarding the emigration of Soviet Jews from the USSR to Israel. Like the U.S. government, we too, believe in the relaxation of international tensions and a just peace with freedom and justice in the world. But the policy of detente does not necessarily mean the abandonment of our belief in the rights of the individual regardless of his creed, color or national origin.

We hope, Mr. Secretary, that you will heed our plea and will use the power of your high office to save the lives of Valentyn Moroz and Leonid Plyushch. Both our government as well as that of the USSR stand to gain by demonstrating their sensitivity to the pleas of hundreds of thousands of men and women throughout the world who are deeply concerned for these Ukrainian political prisoners and who appeal and act in whatever way they can for the release of these two Ukrainian intellectuals.

Respectfully yours,

LEV E. DOBRIANSKY,

President.

JOSEPH LESAWYER,

Executive Director.

Executive Vice President.

IVAN BAZARKO,

IGNATIUS M. BILLINSKY,

Secretary.

SENATE—Monday, August 12, 1974

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by Hon. FLOYD K. HASKELL, a Senator from the State of Colorado.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who doeth all things well, we thank Thee for dispelling the clouds of darkness from the landscape of the Nation and for the light which sheds its ray upon our pathway to the future. In the march of history, give us a vision of Thy purpose and move us to greater deeds of service. Guide us to a more perfect justice, to equality of opportunity and to that spirit of liberty which nourishes truth and righteousness.

Be graciously near to the President that he may think wisely, speak clearly, and act confidently. Grant us receptive minds and hearts as he speaks to the Nation. Forge us once more into one united people, "strong in the Lord and in the power of His might."

And to Thee shall be all glory and praise. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., August 12, 1974.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. FLOYD K. HASKELL, a Senator from the State of Colorado, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
President pro tempore.

Mr. HASKELL thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

QUORUM CALL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, August 9, 1974, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House insists upon its amendment to the bill (S. 3698) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, to enable Congress to concur in or disapprove international agreements for cooperation in regard to